

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,

OR
CRITICAL JOURNAL:

FOR
JULY, 1885 OCTOBER, 1885.

TO BE CONTINUED QUARTERLY.

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR.

PUBLIUS SYRUS.

VOL. CLXII.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO., LONDON.

ADAM AND CHARLES BLACK,
EDINBURGH.

1885.

PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
LONDON

CONTENTS OF No. 332.

	Page
ART. I.—English Men of Letters, edited by John Morley.—Cole- ridge. By H. D. Traill. London: 1884, . . .	301
II.—1. M. Pasteur. Histoire d'un Savant par un Ignorant. Par Valéry Radot. Paris: 1884.	
2. Louis Pasteur, his Life and Labours. By his Son-in- Law. Translated from the French by Lady Claud Hamilton. London: 1885.	
3. Micro-Organisms and Disease. An Introduction into the Study of Specific Micro-Organisms. By E. Klein, M.D., F.R.S., Joint Lecturer on General Anatomy and Physiology to the Medical School of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. London: 1884, . . .	352
III.—1. Zoroaster. By E. Marion Crawford. 2 vols. Lon- don: 1885.	
2. History of the Parsis. By Dosabhai Framji Karaka, C.S.I. London: 1884.	
3. The Sacred Books of the East. Edited by F. Max Müller. Volumes iv. and xxiii.: The Zend-Avesta, translated by James Darmesteter. Volumes v. and xviii.: Pahlavi Texts, translated by E. W. West. Oxford: 1880-3.	
4. Ormazd et Ahriman, leurs Origines et leur Histoire. Par J. Darmesteter. Paris: 1877.	
5. Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Re- ligion of the Parsees. By Martin Haug, Ph.D. Third edition, edited and enlarged by E. W. West, Ph.D. London: 1884.	
6. Ostiranische Kultur im Alterthume. Von Wilhelm Geiger. Erlangen: 1882.	
7. Des Origines du Zoroastrisme. Par C. de Harlez. Paris: 1879.	
8. Avesta. Livre sacré du Zoroastrisme, traduit du Texte Zend avec Notes et Introduction. Par C. de Harlez. Paris: 1881,	386
IV.—Frédéric II et Louis XV, d'après des documents nou- veaux. 1742-1744. Par le Duc de Broglie. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1885,	410

V.—The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the Original Tongues: being the Authorised Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge: 1885,	448
VI.—The Greville Memoirs (Second Part): being a Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852. By the late Charles Cavendish F. Greville, Esq., Clerk of the Council. Three volumes. 8vo. London: 1885,	495
VII.—Types of Ethical Theory. By James Martineau, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Manchester New College. Two volumes. 8vo. London and Oxford (Clarendon Press): 1885,	536
VIII.—1. Address of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., to the Electors of Midlothian, September, 1885.	
2. The Radical Programme, with a Preface by the Right Hon. Joseph Chamberlain, M.P., September, 1885.	
3. Peasant Properties and other Selected Essays. By Lady Verney. 2 vols. London: 1885.	
4. Socialism at St. Stephen's, 1869–1885. A speech delivered by the Earl of Wemyss in the House of Lords, July 31, 1885.	
5. Return of the Number of Assessments to the Income Tax, from April 1875 to April 1884, under Schedules D and E.	
6. Report of the Committee of Council on Education (England and Wales), 1884–5. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1885,	558

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW.

JULY, 1885.

No. CCCXXXI.

- ART. I. —1. *Poems by John Keats.* 16mo. London: 1817.
2. *Endymion: a Poetic Romance.* By JOHN KEATS. 8vo. London: 1818.
3. *Lamia, Isabella, The Eve of St. Agnes, and other Poems.* By JOHN KEATS, author of 'Endymion.' 12mo. London: 1820.
4. *Poetical Works and other Writings of John Keats.* Edited by H. BUXTON FORMAN. 4 vols. 8vo. London: 1883.
5. *Letters of Keats to Fanny Brawne.* Edited by H. B. FORMAN. 8vo. London: 1878.

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL catalogue of the editions of the works of John Keats, from the first timid publication of the *Poems* by C. and J. Ollier in 1817 down to the complete production of all the poet's works and writings in four octavo volumes, which has recently been given to the world by Mr. H. Buxton Forman, would demonstrate in the most indisputable manner how slow and gradual has been the growth of Keats's poetical fame. At no period of its course has it ever shot up like a rocket into the sky, or blazed like a meteor; its developement has been rather like the growth of some noble plant, silently, continuously, gradually attaining its consummation. The sale of the first editions of his various poems, now eagerly sought for by the curious, was at first slow and uncertain. The earliest venture of his genius, the small volume '*Poems: 1817,*' was all but forgotten soon after its publication; '*Endymion*' was treated with scorn and contempt; and the third, or '*Lamia,*' volume, met with but a chill reception. Few, indeed, were those who loved and understood the poetry of Keats during his life. Dispirited by the manner in which his poems had been received, pro-

strated by a mortal malady, feeling all the stings of poverty, he died in the belief that his name and fame were destined to early and complete extinction. But the publication of Lord Houghton's 'Life, Letters, and Literary Remains' in 1848, was the commencement of a new era for Keats's fame; and from that time edition has succeeded edition from the London press, and the publishers of the United States outvie our own in the sumptuousness of their editions of Keats. No English poet (we speak not of the living) belonging to the Augustan age of English poetry in the nineteenth century is more read and, when read and understood, more passionately loved than Keats. The tender hope he once expressed to his brother George, 'I think I shall be 'among the English poets after my death'—how completely and signally has it been fulfilled!

Nearly thirty years elapsed after the death of the poet before an adequate life of him appeared. This signal service to literature was rendered, as we have said, by Mr. Monckton Milnes, afterwards Lord Houghton. It remains to this day the best biography of Keats; its fine and genial estimate of the poet has lent the keynote to all subsequent criticism of his poetical genius. But in those volumes, which Lord Houghton modestly claimed only to have edited, there lived the labours of one of the truest of all the friends of the poet. About the year 1833 Lord Houghton met, at Landor's Villa at Fiesole, Mr. Charles Armitage Brown, a retired Russia merchant, in whom he found one who had been the generous protector of Keats and who ever remained an enthusiastic admirer of his poetry. It had been Mr. Brown's intention to write a life of Keats, for which he had made much preparation, especially in the collection of his letters; but a strange and sudden change of purpose led him, comparatively late in life, and a few years after his introduction to Lord Houghton, to transfer his fortunes to New Zealand. His life afterwards seems a blank: even the year of his death is not accurately known; it is conjectured that he died in 1842. More, however, should be ascertained regarding him, if only for Keats's sake. The author of a volume of no mean ability on Shakespeare's autobiographical poems, the helpful friend of the poet, ought not to have died in New Zealand without leaving a single wrack behind him. Before leaving for his new home he entrusted all his Keatsian collections, together with what he had prepared of his projected life, to Lord Houghton. This constituted the basis of his Lordship's labours, which, largely augmented by important

contributions from Cowden Clarke and other then living members of the Keats's circle—above all by the letters of the poet to his brother George in America, placed at his disposal by Mr. Jeffrey, who married the widow of George Keats—appeared as the well-known ‘Life, Letters, and Remains,’ in 1848. But by far the most important edition of the poet's poems and letters has been recently given to the world under the editorship of Mr. H. Buxton Forman in four very handsome and carefully printed volumes. The text has been constructed from a collation of the early editions with all the available manuscript transcripts of the poems. The posthumous and fugitive pieces fill a large portion of the second volume: ‘Otho the Great,’ a tragedy in five acts; ‘King Stephen,’ a dramatic fragment; and ‘The Cap and Bells,’ are reproduced, together with other poems, from the second volume of Lord Houghton's ‘Life, Letters, and Remains.’ It is the duty of an editor to make the edition of his author as complete as possible. No doubt Mr. Forman aspired to produce a final edition, but we question whether the fame of Keats has not rather suffered than gained by the publication of the larger portion of the posthumous poems which swell the contents of his second volume, though several of the sonnets thus rescued and transmitted to posterity no lover of poetry or of Keats would like to see omitted. The same may be said undoubtedly of the ‘Epistle to John Hamilton Reynolds,’ of the weird ballad of ‘La belle dame sans merci,’ and pre-eminently of the lovely fragment of an ‘Ode to Maia,’ which, short as it is, would outweigh with us all the posthumous poems put together. But, as long as indiscriminate inclusion, and not discriminate exclusion, is the method and rule prescribed to and followed by editors, Mr. Forman acted, perhaps, wisely in admitting everything, good or bad, in order to make his edition absolutely complete. The collection of letters of Keats to his relations and his friends is a great and interesting feature. Mr. Forman has the merit of publishing for the first time the letters of Keats to his sister Fanny, which exhibit him as the fond and tender brother and wise adviser of the young girl. The Fanny Keats of these letters became the wife of Señor Llanos, a Spanish refugee, a man of liberal principles when liberal principles were dangerous tenets in Spain, and the author of ‘Don Esteban’ and ‘Sandoval the Free-mason.’ Señora Llanos is now living in Madrid, in the enjoyment of active life though she numbers more than eighty years, and is surrounded by children and children's

children. To each volume Mr. Forman has appended what our neighbours so well understand and justly characterise as *pièces justificatives*, which will be found indispensable by everyone who desires to study Keats and the contemporaneous criticism of the poet's works. A perfect repertory of Keatsian literature is, in short, given to the world in the four volumes of Mr. Forman's edition.

The poet John Keats was born October 29,* 1795. He was the eldest of a family of four children, of whom three were boys, John, George, Thomas, and a daughter Fanny, several years younger than her brothers. The father of this family, Thomas Keats, at first employed in a subordinate capacity in the livery-stables of Mr. Jennings in Moorfields, afterwards married his daughter, Fanny Jennings, and in due time became the proprietor and keeper of them. Dr. Richardson, the distinguished authority in sanitary questions, has communicated, in the pages of a journal (April 1884) which he fancifully entitles 'The Asclepiad,' a few interesting facts regarding the Keats family, derived from the recollections of a fellow-student of the poet at Guy's and St. Thomas's, Mr. Henry Stephens, with whom Dr. Richardson lived on terms of great intimacy from 1856 to Mr. Stephens's death in 1864. Of Keats's father it is there said that he was a natural born gentleman, handsome in feature and form, and honourable in all his dealings with the world: and of his mother, who died of consumption while still young, the same authority reports that she too was handsome, and an intelligent and good mother. The appearance of a poet—a great poet—in such a family and from such an environment is a mystery of human nature; we cannot explain it: we leave it to Mr. Galton to account for the phenomenon. Before Keats had completed his ninth year, he lost his father, who died from fracture of the skull caused by a fall from his horse; and about three years afterwards his mother, to whom he appears to have been most tenderly attached. The fortune, though small, 8,000*l.*, which was divided among the four children on the mother's death, shows that the family was left in comparatively easy circumstances.

Before the death of the father, John had been sent to a school of good repute at Enfield, kept by Mr. John Clarke. A son of this first master of Keats, Charles Cowden Clarke, attained some distinction in the world of letters, and ended

* October 31, according to Mr. Forman.

a long life at Genoa in 1877, in his ninetieth year. His recollections of the poet, reprinted in the Appendix to the fourth volume of Mr. Forman's edition, give most interesting and authentic accounts of the boyhood and early youth of Keats. He tells us that the poet 'was one of the little fellows, not 'wholly emerged from the child's costume upon being placed 'under my father's care.' Cowden Clarke was not less than eight years older than Keats, and his account of the poet's habits, of the traits of his character, of his early pursuits, as they fell under his notice, has all the charm of freshness and authenticity. According to these recollections, the early boyhood of the poet was not conspicuous for any precocious indications of intellectual power. He was noted for his steady diligence, 'a most orderly scholar.' The prizes for the greatest quantity of voluntary work at the half-yearly examinations generally fell to young Keats. He was the earliest at work, the last to lay it down. In the latter part of his time at school—says Mr. Cowden Clarke—he read while he ate. He exhausted the school library, consisting chiefly of the accounts of famous voyages and travels. Of Greek he knew nothing, nor was his Latin very deep. His favourite classic was Virgil; before he left school he had translated into prose a considerable portion of the 'Æneid.' At fourteen he left the Enfield school and was apprenticed to Mr. Thomas Hammond, a medical practitioner residing at Edmonton; but this change in his residence and pursuits did not sever his connexion with the kindly Clarke family. He delighted to walk over to Enfield to borrow books and enjoy a long talk with his friend Cowden Clarke, who remembered reading to him, in an arbour of the garden belonging to the schoolhouse, the 'Epithalamion' of Spenser, and noticing as he read the ecstasy depicted in his face, and the wild exclamations of delight that continually broke from him. Returning home in the evening, Keats took away with him the first volume of the 'Faerie Queen.' The poetic seed had fallen on most kindly soil; as Clarke says, 'he 'ramped through the pages of it like a young horse turned 'into a spring meadow.' The apprenticeship with Mr. Hammond was never completed; it would appear as if it came to a sudden, if not a violent, termination. Writing to his brother George, September 21, 1819, and speaking of the transmutations through which the body passes: 'Seven years 'ago it was not this hand that clenched itself against Hammond.' From Edmonton he went to London and became a student of Guy's and St. Thomas's. It was there that Mr.

Henry Stephens, of whom mention has been made above, met with him. Cowden Clarke, too, coming to town to begin life—not, however, as a medical student—was soon discovered by Keats, and the young men again drew together, and daily became more intimate. It was not long before Clarke divined that the study of medicine would never gain the heart or enlist the energies of Keats. Though he passed through some of the preliminary examinations incident to the profession with a facility that surprised his friends, he soon virtually abandoned it. One operation it is said he did perform, and with happy success; but the too highly wrought dread of failure scared his imagination, and the knife of the surgeon was never seen again in the poet's hand.

But though lost to the healing art, poetry only more decisively claimed her own child, and won the constant, undying allegiance of her son. Cowden Clarke, who had been so instrumental in kindling the glow of poetic enthusiasm in his heart, was at hand to sustain and nourish it. Together they read Chapman's rich and vigorous translation of Homer. To the good offices of the same friend he owed many introductions of the greatest moment to a youth like Keats, and formed some friendships which were severed only by death. It was Cowden Clarke who introduced him to Leigh Hunt, who records 'the impression made upon me by 'the exuberant specimens of genuine though young poetry 'that was laid before me, and the promise of which was 'seconded by the fine fervid countenance of the writer. We 'became intimate on the spot. We read and walked together, and used to write verses of an evening upon a given 'subject.' The influence of Hunt on Keats would necessarily be great. Born October 1784, Hunt was rather more than ten years his senior; he had greater experience of the world, and more extensive knowledge of men. To the young poet, eager, fiery, and restless, the pleasant geniality of Hunt's character and manners must have been grateful and salutary. His hospitality, unstintingly exercised in his cottage in the Vale of Health on Hampstead Heath—cheered the lonely young poet, who never perhaps found a resting-place for the sole of his foot. The house, though humble in its pretensions, was decorated with works of art; not, it may be, so rich and splendid as would have been found in the houses of the great, but well suited to gratify the tastes of the man who felt then, as ever, that 'a thing of 'beauty is a joy for ever.' Such a house, which was made a home to him, was restful to his unsettled heart. The host,

too, was yet better than his house. Hunt's powers of conversation were admittedly great and uncommon; his knowledge of literature both wide and deep; his poetical talents, though not of a very high order, were considerable and would have achieved a higher reputation for him, had not his works been disfigured by frequent displays of bad taste. His prose, however, is conspicuous for its raciness and lucidity. In other respects, Hunt was not a good companion for a young poet. His habits were desultory; he was without moral dignity or even bashfulness, living on the generosity of others. His opinions on most subjects were wholly unsettled; and in politics he had taken so violent a part, that under the oppressive laws then in force he and his brother had incurred two years' imprisonment—a circumstance which excited the interest of the Liberal party in his favour.

Keats addressed a sonnet to Hunt on the day of his liberation from prison, and soon afterwards made his personal acquaintance, which ripened rapidly into intimacy and friendship. The little volume, '*Poems by John Keats*,' which had been growing under his hands for some time, appeared early in 1817, published by C. and J. Ollier, and bears many signs and proofs of his affection and reverence for his friend. It was dedicated to Leigh Hunt in a sonnet improvised, when the last sheet was brought from the printer with an intimation that if a dedication were intended, a dedication must be at once forwarded. The sonnet to Leigh Hunt was the immediate answer. Nor was this the only mode in which he is commemorated; thrice he is mentioned as *Libertas* in its pages. The unobtrusive little volume was launched into the world, as Cowden Clarke tells us, amid the cheers and fond anticipations of all his circle—a body of young men of ability and literary promise. A sensation was expected by them; but never were the hopes of friends more thoroughly chilled and blasted. The sale, never great, soon came to an absolute standstill. The Olliers, publishers of the volume, replying to the eager, and it may be petulant, enquiries of George Keats, tell him, about three months after its publication, 'that the curiosity is satisfied, and the sale has dropped. By far the greater number of persons who have purchased it from us have found fault with it in such plain terms that we have in many cases offered to take the book back rather than be annoyed with the ridicule which has time after time been showered upon it.' What effect this had on Keats himself we have no means of knowing; in the

letters collected and arranged by Mr. Buxton Forman, we cannot detect a single expression betraying either irritation or disappointment at this galling reception.

Yet what exquisite poetry, not of mere promise only, is contained in that little volume thus contemptuously received ! The very first page of the first poem should have proclaimed the advent of a true poet. Though Keats was deeply imbued with the spirit of Spenser, it is rather remarkable that among the poems of this volume there is only one avowed imitation of this poet, and that so feeble as scarcely to deserve mention. It is the measure of Marlow and of Dryden that prevails. The three Epistles to George Felton Mathew, to his brother George, and to Charles Cowden Clarke, are tentatives in the style and manner which Dryden had employed in his celebrated Epistles. Of these the one addressed to Clarke is the most interesting as well as distinctively original. The Keats that we know in his later and more matured efforts is already there. Commemorating his obligations to his old friend, he writes :—

‘ You first taught me all the sweets of song :
The grand, the sweet, the terse, the free, the fine ;
What swell’d with pathos, and what right divine ;
Spenserian vowels that elope with ease,
And float along like birds o’er summer seas ;
Miltonian storms, and more, Miltonian tenderness ;
Michael in arms, and more, meek Eve’s fair slenderness.
Who read for me the sonnet swelling loudly
Up to its climax and then dying proudly ?
Who found for me the grandeur of the Ode,
Growing, like Atlas, stronger from its load ? ’

The longer poems, written in the same measure, the first and the last in the volume, are laden with poetic beauties of a high order. ‘ I stood tip-toe upon a little hill,’ was the poem suggested—according to Leigh Hunt—by a delightful summer day, as Keats stood beside the gate that leads from the battery on Hampstead Heath into a field by Caen Wood :—

‘ The clouds were pure and white as flocks new shorn,
And fresh from the clear brook ; sweetly they slept
On the blue fields of heaven, and then there crept
A little noiseless noise among the leaves,
Born of the very sigh that silence heaves :
For not the faintest motion could be seen
Of all the shades that slanted o’er the green.’

And did ever summer day elicit from poet’s fancy a more

apt and graceful description of a flower than is contained in these lines ?—

‘ Here are sweet peas, on tip-toe for a flight ;
With wings of gentle flush o’er delicate white,
And taper fingers catching at all things
To bind them all about with tiny rings.’

But it is the moon, the tenderness of her light, the legends which surround her, that occupy the poet’s thoughts in the greater part of this poem. Touching on some of these, he comes at last to the story of Cynthia and Endymion ; which, notwithstanding its length, we shall present to our readers as a specimen of the earlier poetic powers of Keats.

‘ He was a Poet, sure a lover too,
Who stood on Latmus’ top, what time there blew
Soft breezes from the myrtle vale below ;
And brought in faintness solemn, sweet, and slow,
A hymn from Dian’s temple ; while upswelling,
The incense went to her own starry dwelling ;
But though her face was clear as infants’ eyes,
Though she stood smiling o’er the sacrifice,
The Poet wept at her so piteous fate,
Wept that such beauty should be desolate ;
So in fine wrath some golden sounds he won,
And gave meek Cynthia her Endymion.
Queen of the wide air, thou most lovely queen
Of all the brightness that mine eyes have seen !
As thou exceedest all things in thy shine,
So every tale does this sweet tale of thine.
O for three words of honey, that I might
Tell but one wonder of thy bridal night !

Where distant ships do seem to show their keels
Phœbus awhile delay’d his mighty wheels,
And turn’d to smile upon thy bashful eyes,
Ere he his unseen pomp would solemnize.
The evening weather was so bright and clear,
That men of health were of unusual cheer ;
Stepping like Homer at the trumpet’s call,
Or young Apollo on the pedestal ;
And lovely women were as fair and warm
As Venus looking sideways in alarm.
The breezes were ethereal and pure,
And crept through half-closed lattices to cure
The languid sick ; it cooled their fevered sleep,
And soothed them into slumbers full and deep.
Soon they awoke clear-eyed, nor burnt with thirsting,
Nor with hot fingers, nor with temples bursting ;

And springing up, they met the wond'ring sight
 Of their dear friends, nigh foolish with delight,
 Who feel their arms and breasts, and kiss and stare,
 And on their placid foreheads part the hair.
 Young men and maidens at each other gazed,
 With hands held back, and motionless, amazed
 To see the brightness in each other's eyes ;
 And so they stood, fill'd with a sweet surprise,
 Until their tongues were loos'd in poesy.
 Therefore no lover did of anguish die :
 But the soft numbers in that moment spoken
 Made silken ties that never may be broken.

The last poem in this volume, 'Sleep and Poetry,' originated in a sleepless night passed by Keats in Hunt's cottage at Hampstead, after an evening spent in high talk. He went to rest on a sofa in Hunt's library, a room decorated with busts and prints ; but instead of sleep there rose before him visions of the power and scope of Poesy ; interrupted by the thought of mortality which dashes his lofty imaginations :—

'Stop and consider ! life is but a day :
 A fragile-dewdrop on its perilous way
 From a tree's summit: a poor Indian's sleep
 While his boat hastens to the monstrous steep
 Of Montmorenci. Why so sad a moan ?
 Life is the rose's hope while yet unblown :
 The reading of an ever-changing tale ;
 The light uplifting of a maiden's veil :
 A pigeon tumbling in clear summer air ;
 A laughing schoolboy, without grief or care,
 Riding the springy branches of an elm.'

And this consciousness of mortality wrings from him these words made so pathetic by his own early death :—

'O for ten years, that I may overwhelm
 Myself in poesy ; so I may do the deed
 That my own soul has to itself decreed.
 Then I will pass the countries that I see
 In long perspective, and continually
 Taste their pure fountains. First the realm I'll pass
 Of Flora, and old Pan ; sleep in the grass,
 Feed upon apples red and strawberries,
 And choose each pleasure that my fancy sees.'

But to the dreams and fancies of the youthful poet he feels he must bid adieu—

'Yes, I must pass them for a nobler life,
 Where I may find the agonies, the strife,

Of human hearts ; for lo ! I see afar,
 O'er sailing the blue cragginess, a car
 And steeds with streaming manes—the charioteer
 Looks out upon the winds with glorious fear :

The visions all are fled—the car is fled
 Into the light of heaven, and in their stead
 A sense of real things comes doubly strong ;
 And like a muddy stream, would bear along
 My soul to nothingness ; but I will strive
 Against all doubtings, and will keep alive
 The thought of that same chariot, and the strange
 Journey it went.'

Nor should we omit to notice that Keats exhibited in this early volume a very considerable mastery of one of the most difficult forms of poetry. In it we have seventeen sonnets, not all, indeed, of high merit, but some of singular power and beauty. One of them has been greatly admired—the sonnet which commemorates his exultation of feeling inspired by reading Chapman's Homer :—

' Much have I travelled in the realms of gold,
 And many goodly states and kingdoms seen ;
 Round many western islands have I been,
 Which bards in fealty to Apollo hold.
 Oft of one wide expanse had I been told,
 That deep-browed Homer ruled as his demesne ;
 Yet did I never breathe its pure serene,
 Till I heard Chapman speak out loud and bold ;
 Then felt I like some watcher of the skies
 When a new planet swims into his ken ;
 Or like stout Cortez, when with eagle eyes
 He stared at the Pacific, and all his men
 Looked at each other with a wild surmise—
 Silent upon a peak in Darien.'

It was Balboa, not Cortez, who first gazed on the mighty Pacific from a peak of Darien, but this mistake in no way interferes with the poetical merit of the sonnet. It is not easy to find in the whole range of our literature greater effect produced by simple language than that of the concluding line,

' Silent upon a peak in Darien.'

The letter of Mr. Ollier, from which we have already quoted, tells how the little volume, full of promise and instinct with beauty, was received. It encountered the worst fate that can befall the work of an author. ' I would rather,' said Johnson, ' be attacked than unnoticed. The worst

'thing you can do to an author is to be silent as to his 'books.' It is impossible to think that Keats, young, ardent, and sensitive, could be indifferent to the reception of his volume; but he was too proud, too self-reliant, to betray either depression or irritation. The passage of the discarded preface to 'Endymion,' in which he speaks of the manner in which his first venture had been received, has in this aspect a peculiar interest of its own:—

'About a twelvemonth since, I published a little book of verses it was read by some dozen of my friends, who liked it, and some dozen whom I was acquainted with, who did not. Now, when a dozen human beings are at words with another dozen, it becomes a matter of anxiety to side with one's friends, more especially when excited thereto by a great love of Poetry.' (Forman, vol. i. p. 115.)

These words surely display no small amount of self-control, and show that if there were disappointment it was merged in a higher purpose. The closing lines of the beautiful poem, 'I stood tip-toe upon a little hill,' proclaim how his imagination had divined the poetical possibilities of the legend of Endymion. To this he remained constant, and whatever vexations may have lurked within him, these are all forgotten or suppressed in the steady devotion to the construction of the poem, which he elaborated with amazing persistency, and with the mechanical regularity of a mere clerk. It was begun, most probably, at Carisbrooke in April, continued through the early summer months at Margate, Canterbury, and other places, till in September we find him living in rooms at Magdalen with his friend Benjamin Bailey. There he completed the third book. From Oxford he moved to the neighbourhood of Leatherhead, and finished the composition of the poem at Burford Bridge, November 28. The winter of 1817–1818 he spent at Hampstead, carrying his work through the press. It was published April 1818; and thus 'Endymion,' a poem of more than 4,000 lines, full of poetical invention, rich in glorious imagery, musical as Apollo's lute, was begun, completed, and published within a year—an astonishing achievement.

'Tis with full happiness that I
Will trace the story of Endymion.
The very music of the name has gone
Into my being.'

The legend in its simplest primitive form had from an early time haunted his imagination: a beautiful youth, a shepherd on Mount Latmos in Caria, who was kissed by

Artemis or Diana as he lay asleep. Keats knew nothing of the interpretations which the philosophy of mythology would read into it. In a letter to Benjamin Bailey, which is all-important for the clear understanding of Keats's extraordinary fertility in the construction and composition of his poem, he writes: 'It ["Endymion"] will be a test, a trial of my powers of imagination, and chiefly of my invention—which is a rare thing indeed—by which I must make 4,000 lines of one bare circumstance, and fill them with 'poetry.' The one bare circumstance he derived from *Lemprière's Dictionary* or *Tooke's 'Pantheon,'* as he might have derived it from any other school book, good or bad, used in Mr. Clarke's school at Enfield. This is the extent of his obligation to that worthless dictionary, which he was said by Byron, in the plenitude of his insolence and levity, to have versified. It was the shaping spirit of the poet's imagination which supplied the rest, and built on that slight foundation the wondrous fabric of 'Endymion.' He was jealous, too, of any interference with the romance he was constructing. In the same letter to Bailey which we have just quoted, there occurs this notable passage: 'I refused to visit Shelley that I might have my own unfettered scope.' Shelley spent 1817 chiefly at Great Marlow; the poem 'Laon and Cythna' was written in his boat, as he floated under the beech groves at Bisham; while, at no great distance from him, Keats was in Oxford with Bailey, steadily working during the month of September at the third book. This invitation, as we have seen, he refused, in order that he might have his own unfettered scope. No reproach of Shelley is, we believe, conveyed in these words; but having formed his scheme, having advanced as far as the third book in the composition of it, he seems to have feared lest the suggestions Shelley might have made would interfere with the free course of his invention, or prejudice his claim to originality.

Another remark of great interest we find in a letter to his brothers. Keats was now at Hampstead, and had shown the first book of his poem to Leigh Hunt, who took exception to it in a very narrow and captious spirit: 'He allows it not much merit as a whole; says it is unnatural, and made ten objections to it in the mere skimming over. He says the conversation'—no doubt between Endymion and Peona—'is unnatural and too high-flown for brother and sister; says it should be simple—forgetting, do ye mind, that they were both overshadowed by a supernatural

‘power, and of course could not speak like Francesca in the ‘*Rimini*.’ He must first prove,’ adds Keats with equal truth and justice, ‘that Caliban’s poetry is unnatural. This ‘with me completely overturns his objections.’ We are not here concerned so much with the sufficient answer of Keats to the unworthy objections of Leigh Hunt, as with the pregnant conception that Endymion and Peona are ‘overshadowed by a supernatural power,’ which is the key, as we take it, to the true interpretation of the whole poem. The originality of his inventive powers, the free play of his fancy and imagination, are finely, if not equably, displayed as he conducts Endymion through the various stages of his probationary discipline, till he is at last taken up by his goddess to enjoy with her the immortality to which through ‘Phœbe his passion’ he had been raised and spiritualised. If ‘Endymion’ be a failure, as Mr. Matthew Arnold, one of his most genial critics, seems constrained to admit, the cause lay not so much in the immaturity of the poetical powers of Keats as in the choice of the theme. The subject-matter was unhappy—indeed, quite impossible of successful treatment. But the poem notwithstanding contains extraordinary beauties. ‘A thing of beauty is a joy for ever’—a line true and beautiful, and quoted even to satiety—is of course known to all, but there are many lines of equal truth and yet more musical rhythm bestrewn among the 4,000 lines of the poem; and in a review of the poetical works of Keats we claim a little space to show the truth of our contention.

The scene opens on a mighty forest outspread on the sides of Mount Latmos, through which there ran a multitude of paths—

‘all leading pleasantly
To a wide lawn, whence one could only see
Stems thronging all around between the swoll
Of turf and slanting branches; who could tell
The freshness of the space of heaven above,
Edg’d round with dark tree tops? through which a dove
Would often beat its wings, and often too
A little cloud would move across the blue.’

In the middle of this pleasantness there stood a marble altar, round which gather troops of children, damsels, and shepherds, which precede the approach of the chariot with three steeds of dapple brown, in which is seated Endymion. The assembly, ranged in a circle, stand silent round the shrine, and the venerable priest having sacrificed to the great

god Pan, the chorus sings the universally admired Hymn to Pan—too long to be quoted here. The burden of song ended,

‘Young companies nimbly began dancing
To the swift treble pipe, and humming string.
Aye, those fair living forms swam heavenly
To tunes forgotten—out of memory.
Fair creatures! whose young children’s children bred
Thermopylæ its heroes—not yet dead,
But in old marbles ever beautiful.
High genitors, unconscious did they cull
Time’s sweet first fruits.’

While the young thus dance on ‘shady levels, mossy fine,’
Endymion and the aged priest and ‘shepherds gone in eld’
discoursed upon the

‘fragile bar
‘That keeps us from our homes ethereal.’
‘Anon they wander’d by divine converse
Into Elysium: vying to rehearse
Each one his own anticipated bliss.’

A personage, unknown to Lemprière, Tooke, and the like,
Peona, with her ‘kind eyes—the very home and haunt of
‘sisterly affection,’ now appears.

‘Her eloquence did breathe away the curse,’
and she leads him to her own
‘arbour, overwove
By many a summer’s silent fingering.’

In this bower

‘Endymion was calm’d to life again.
Opening his eyelids with a healthier brain,’

he bids her dismiss all fears that he will any longer pass his
days alone and sad.

‘So be thou cheered, sweet,
And, if thy lute is here, softly intreat
My soul to keep in its resolved course.’

Hereat Peona took her lute and sang

‘a lay
More subtle cadenced, more forest wild
Than Dryope’s lone lulling of her child;
And nothing since has floated in the air
So mournful strange.’

But seeing Endymion’s ‘spirit melt away and thaw’ she
casts the lute aside and fondly presses him to reveal to her
his mysterious secret. He now tells her how in a favourite

nook, in the very pride of June, he beheld a magic bed of dittany and poppies, where none had bloomed before, how he falls asleep, and

‘Methought I lay
Watching the zenith, where the milky way
Among the stars in virgin splendour pours;
And travelling my eye, until the doors
Of heaven appeared to open for my flight,
I became loth and fearful to alight
From such high soaring by a downward glance:
So kept me stedfast in that airy trance,
Spreading imaginary pinions wide.
When, presently, the stars began to glide,
And faint away, before my eager view:
At which I sighed that I could not pursue,
And dropt my vision to the horizon’s verge:
And lo! from opening clouds I saw emerge
The loveliest moon that ever silvered o’er
A shell for Neptune’s goblet; she did soar
So passionately bright, my dazzled soul
Commingle with her argent spheres did roll
Through clear and cloudy, even when she went
At last into a dark and vapoury tent—
Whereat methought, the lidless-eyed train
Of planets all were in the blue again.’

Endymion ‘even dares to press her very cheek against my ‘crowned lip;’ but after a time sleep overpowers him, his sweet vision falls into nothing, till, waking up, he started—

‘Ah! my sighs, my tears,
My clenched hands; for lo! the poppies hung
Dew-dabbled on their stalks; the ouzel sung
A heavy ditty, and the sullen day
Had chidden herald Hesperus away
With leaden looks; the solitary breeze
Blustered, and slept, and his wild self did tease
With wayward melancholy; and I thought,
Mark me, Peona! that sometimes it brought
Faint fare-thee-wells, and sigh-shrilled adieus!
Away I wander’d, all the pleasant hues
Of heaven and earth had faded.’

Commonest things fill him with nauseous discontent; but at length

‘Time, that aged nurse,
Rocked me to patience. Now, thank gentle heaven,
These things, with all their comfortings, are given
To my down-sunken hours, and with thee,
Sweet sister, help to stem the ebbing sea
Of weary life.’

Thus he ends his strange tale, while Peona loth to answer,
yet fearing to keep silence, breaks forth at last in lines of
finest irony, concluding with an appeal of extraordinary
beauty and eloquence:—

‘Endymion!

Be rather in the trumpet’s mouth—anon
Among the winds at large—that all may hearken!
Although, before the crystal heavens darken,
I watch and dote upon the silver lakes
Pictured in western cloudiness, that takes
The semblance of gold rocks and bright gold sands,
Islands, and creeks, and amber-fretted strands
With horses prancing o’er them, palaces
And towers of amethyst—would I so tease
My pleasant days, because I could not mount
Into those regions? The Morphean fount
Of that fine element that visions, dreams,
And fitful whims of sleep are made of, streams
Into its airy channels with so subtle,
So thin a breathing, not the spider’s shuttle,
Circled a million times within the space
Of a swallow’s nest-door, could delay a trace,
A tinting of its quality: how light
Must dreams themselves be; seeing they’re more slight
Than the mere nothing that engenders them!
Then wherefore sully the entrusted gem
Of high and noble life with thoughts so sick?
Why pierce high-fronted honour to the quick
For nothing but a dream?’

To this appeal, Endymion makes answer and recounts to her
the time and place of two other appearances of his goddess.
Sitting listlessly by the margin of a fountain deep in the
woody recesses near the matron-temple of Latona—

‘Behold,

A wonder, fair as any I have told—
The same bright face I tasted in my sleep
Smiling in the clear well.’

The fair form disappears again, to reappear once more to
torture him with renewed hope; but promising his sister ‘to
‘fashion his pilgrimage for the world’s dusky brink’—

He rose, faint-smiling like a star
Through autumn mists, and took Peona’s hand.
They steep into the boat and launch’d from land.’

Thus ends the first book. The thousand lines of which it
is composed have yielded us many passages of rare beauty.
We have been diffuse in our extracts, and yet we have

with difficulty refrained from further quotation. But the romance is only opening out its wonders and enchantments. Three thousand lines yet remain, which the poet, true to his purpose, has filled with the inventions of his imagination. Amazement fills our minds as he leads his hero through the wonders of the deep, the sea, the heavens, till *Endymion's* sum of discipline is filled up and he spiritualised from his mortal state. The episodes in this magical history display the astonishing fertility of his inventive powers. They justify his own words, as we find them in the letter to Benjamin Bailey, which has already furnished us another striking quotation:—‘A long poem is a test of invention, which I take to be the polestar of poetry, as Fancy is the sails and Imagination the rudder. Did our great poets ever write short pieces? I mean in the shape of Tales. This same invention seems, indeed, of late years to have been forgotten as a poetical excellence.’ We doubt whether any poet ever surpassed Keats in this supreme gift of genius. But it would far exceed the most generous measure of quotation which might be accorded to us, if we attempted to give from these three remaining books of ‘*Endymion*’ a tithe of the passages which arrest attention. Beauty succeeds beauty with a profusion that is positively bewildering. A few illustrative examples only can be given. The second book begins with this apostrophe to the enduring interest of the power of love:—

‘Hence, pageant history! hence, gilded cheat!
 Swart planet in the universe of deeds!
 Wide sea that one continuous murmur breeds
 Along the pebbled shore of memory!
 Many old rotten-timber’d boats there be
 Upon thy vaporous bosom, magnified
 To goodly vessels; many a sail of pride
 And golden-keel’d, is left unlaunch’d and dry.
 But wherefore this? What care, though owl did fly
 About the great Athenian admiral’s mast?
 What care, though striding Alexander past
 The Indus with his Macedonian numbers?
 Though old Ulysses tortured from his slumbers
 The gluttled Cyclops, what care?—Juliet leaning
 Amid her window flowers,—sighing,—weaning
 Tenderly her fancy from its maiden snow,
 Doth more avail than these; the silver flow
 Of Hero’s tears, the swoon of Imogen,
 Fair Pastorella in the bandit’s den,
 Are things to brood on with more ardency
 Than the death-day of empires.’ (Book ii. 14–35.)

One quotation more and we have done. It is from the prelude to the fourth book, in which is celebrated, though in one of the obscurest portions of the whole poem, the rise and progress of English poetry:—

‘ Oh thou hast won
A full accomplishment ! The thing is done,
Which undone, these our latter days had risen
On barren souls. Great Muse, thou know’st what prison
Of flesh and bone curbs and confines and frets
Our spirit’s wings ; despondency besets
Our pillows ; and the fresh to-morrow morn
Seems to give forth its light in very scorn
Of our dull, uninspired, snail-paced lives.
Long have I said, how happy he who shrives
To thee ! But then I thought on poets gone,
And could not pray—nor can I now ; so on
I move to the end in lowliness of heart.’

The volume being ready for the press, a preface only was needed. That which was first drawn up was objected to by Reynolds and others who acted for Keats:—

‘ Since you all agree that the thing is bad, it must be so —though I am not aware there is anything like Hunt in it ; and if there is, it is my natural way, and I have something in common with Hunt. I have not the slightest feel of humility towards the public, or to anything in existence but the Eternal being, the principle of beauty, and the memory of great men. . . . If I write another preface, it must be done without thought of those people. I will think about it.’

This was written April 9, 1818 ; the day after another preface was in the hands of Reynolds:—

‘ I am anxious you should find this preface tolerable. . . . I had an idea of giving no preface ; however, don’t you think this had better go ? Oh let it ! One should not be too timid of committing faults.’ (Forman, vol. iii. p. 143.)

That second cast of it was, happily, adopted and printed. While frankly admitting the imperfection and immaturity of this youthful but ambitious attempt, he makes an appeal, almost pathetic, to critics who look with a zealous eye to the honour of English literature, not to be too forward to condemn what they may find amiss in a poem whose faults he only too plainly sees. How certain critics met this modest yet manly appeal is too well known.

It was written from Teignmouth, whither he had gone earlier in the year to be with his youngest brother, whom pulmonary consumption had marked for its own. There he remained till June, when he accompanied his friend, Charles Armitage

Brown, in a tour to the Lakes of England and the Highlands of Scotland. Some fruits of these excursions are found among the posthumous poems in Mr. Forman's second volume; but had they been more numerous, beautiful, and refreshing than they are, they would have been dearly bought at the price of the shattered health which he brought home with him. He caught a severe cold in the Isle of Mull. The fatigue, the chills, the damps of that tour were the forerunners of his fatal attacks in 1820. At Inverness he parted from his companion and sailed from Cromarty 'in a smack' for the Thames. After a rough voyage of nine days he presented himself at Hampstead before Mrs. Dilke, the wife of his friend, who thus described his appearance: 'John Keats arrived here last night (August 19, 1818) as brown and shabby as you can imagine; scarcely any shoes left, his jacket all torn at the back, a fur cap, a great plaid and his knapsack. I cannot tell what he looked like.' There was little to cheer him in his Hampstead home, if home it could be called. His brother's health was evidently worse, and his own not obscurely threatened with the constitutional malady. Just then also had appeared the August number (1818) of 'Blackwood's Magazine' with the article No. 4 of the series on the Cockney School, and its representative John Keats; and in September following the number of the 'Quarterly' with the article on 'Endymion,' universally attributed to Mr. Gifford. These two articles have obtained an ill-favoured notoriety; nor would it be hard to show how well deserved is the odium they have since excited. We allude to them because of the effect which they were supposed to exercise on the poet. This alone gives them interest or importance. They serve but as a foil to such noble and manful words as these:—

'Praise or blame have but a momentary effect on the man whose love of beauty in the abstract makes him a severe critic on his own works. My own domestic criticism has given me pain without comparison beyond what "Blackwood" or the "Quarterly" could possibly inflict; and also, when I feel I am right, no external praise can give me such a glow as my own solitary re-perception and ratification of what is fine. J. S. [John Scott] is perfectly right in regard to the "slip-shod Endymion." That it is so is no fault of mine. No! though it may sound a little paradoxical, it is as good as I had power to make it by myself. Had I been nervous about its being a perfect piece, and with that view asked advice, and trembled over every page, it would not have been written; for it is not in my nature to fumble. I will write independently. I have written independently, *without judgement*.

I may write independently and *with judgement* hereafter. The genius of poetry must work out its own salvation in a man. It cannot be matured by law and precept, but by sensation and watchfulness in itself. That which is created must create itself. In "Endymion" I leaped headlong into the sea, and thereby have become better acquainted with the soundings, the quicksands, and the rocks, than if I had stayed upon the green shore and piped a silly pipe, and took tea and comfortable advice. I was never afraid of failure, for I would sooner fail than not be among the greatest.' (Letter to Mr. Hessey, October 9, 1818.)

Let us hear him again:—

'I am ambitious of doing the world some good; if I should be spared, that may be the work of maturer years—in the interval I will assay to reach to as high a summit in poetry as the nerve bestowed upon me will suffer. The faint conceptions I have of poems to come bring the blood frequently into my forehead. All I hope is, that I may not lose all interest in human affairs—that the solitary indifference I feel for applause, even from the finest spirits, will not blunt any acuteness of vision I may have. I do not think it will. I feel assured I should write from the mere yearning and fondness I have for the beautiful, even if my night's labours should be burnt every morning, and no eye ever shine upon them.' (To Mr. Woodhouse, October 27, 1818.)

The man who felt and wrote thus was not the man to be summarily crushed by mere vulgar abuse, nor of the loose fibre which could be 'snuffed out by an article,' as Byron in his levity uttered. But more formidable foes than these were closing round him. The last days of the brother he so tenderly loved were beyond measure distressing. George and his wife were in America; his sister Fanny at school at a distance; his own health he instinctively felt to be feeble and precarious; carking cares filled up the measure of his troubles; he was alone in the world, with poverty and incipient consumption as his companions. It was then that his constant and zealous friend, Charles Armitage Brown, offered him an asylum in his house at Hampstead, which, with occasional absences, became his home till consumption declared itself and he was sent off to Italy—too late! too late! But, strange as it may appear, this was the period of his life during which his poetical powers matured themselves in an astonishing manner. It was then that he wrote 'Hyperion,' 'The Eve of St. Agnes,' 'Lamia,' the bewitchingly beautiful odes to 'The Nightingale,' on the 'Grecian Urn,' and to 'Psyche'—the very flower of his poetry, the richest products of his genius. But, alas! weeks and months even of his short remaining time were wasted in the pursuit of a

mere will-o'-the-wisp. 'One of my ambitions,' he confesses to Bailey, 'is to make as great a revolution in modern dramatic writing as Kean has done in acting.' He must needs be a dramatist; and Brown, who had some share in the construction of the tragedy 'Otho the Great,' contributed to encourage him in this delusion. Other subjects were attempted, but not completed. It was a great misfortune to poetry that Keats ever turned aside from his true functions to waste his time and strength in a domain for which it would seem he had no real capacity; and literature could well have dispensed with the disinterring of dramas which should rather have remained buried and forgotten.

But the noble life, so full of manful effort and splendid promise, was hastening on apace to its close. Returning to Hampstead on the top of the stage-coach in a cold windy night—February 3, 1820—he caught a severe chill. Bleeding from the lungs was the consequence, and his quick eye seeing the blood, he exclaimed: 'I know its colour: it is arterial blood; I must die.' But the native vigour of his constitution would not easily yield; he soon partially recovered strength, and was able to write to his sister and his friends. How interesting is the letter which he wrote (February 16, 1820) to Mr. Rice shortly after the attack!—

'How astonishingly does the chance of leaving the world impress a sense of its natural beauties upon us! Like poor Falstaff, though I do not babble, I think of green fields; I muse with the greatest affection on every flower I have known from my infancy: their shapes and colours are as new to me as if I had just created them with a superhuman fancy. It is because they are connected with the most thoughtless and the happiest moments of our lives. I have seen foreign flowers in hot-houses of the most beautiful nature, but I do not care a straw for them. The simple flowers of our spring are what I want to see again.'

Amid alternations of weakness and strength, of hope and despair, the 'Lamia' volume was actively prepared; and Shelley learns from Keats himself, under date August 1820, 'that the volume would never have seen the light but for the hope of gain.' A great presence, however, appeared, when the volume entitled 'Lamia, Isabella, The Eve of St. Agnes, and other Poems,' issued from the press, a presence higher, mightier, and more enduring than the poor sinking poet. To it we must turn our attention, hiding from our eyes for a time the sufferings of its creator.

Of the poems contained in this volume it is certain that 'Isabella, or the Pot of Basil,' was the earliest composed.

On April 27, 1818, Keats tells Reynolds that the 'Pot of Basil' is finished; and later on (June 10) he writes to Bailey, 'I want to read you my "Pot of Basil."' These dates settle a point of some interest. Mr. W. T. Arnold in his instructive introduction to his edition of the Poems of Keats expresses the opinion that the publication of Byron's 'Beppo' had more to do with Keats's use of the *ottava rima* than his own direct study of the Italian poets; but we are compelled to differ from Mr. Arnold, for 'Beppo,' though written at Venice in 1817, was not published in London till May 1818, whereas Keats, as we have seen above, states that his poem was already finished in the preceding April, portions of it at an even earlier date. We question, too, whether he derived his metre directly from the study of the Italian poets; it was most probably adopted from examples found in our own poets, perhaps in Fairfax. The story of the 'Pot of Basil' is in the main Boccaccio's; but of the pathos, the purity, the tenderness of Keats's 'Isabella,' the great Italian has nothing. There is greater delicacy, more refinement of feeling, in the love passages of this poem than we find in 'Endymion' or the earlier poems. How tender is this third stanza, descriptive of the love of Lorenzo for Isabella!—

'He knew whose gentle hand was at the latch
 Before the door had given her to his eyes;
 And from her chamber window he could catch
 Her beauty farther than the falcon spies,
 And constant as her vespers would he watch,
 Because her face was turned to the same skies,
 And with sick longing all the night outwear,
 To hear her morning step upon the stair.'

From this tale we might give many fine passages, powerfully and picturesquely describing its tragic scenes—the assassination of Lorenzo by the two brothers; his appearance in a vision to Isabella; the consequent discovery of the body by Isabella and her nurse—but we must confine ourselves to three specially striking stanzas:—

'Who hath not loitered in a green churchyard,
 And let his spirit, like a demon mole,
 Work through the clayey soil and gravel hard,
 To see skull, coffin bones, and funeral stole,
 Pitying each form that hungry death hath marr'd,
 And filling it once more with human soul?
 Ah! this is holiday to what was felt
 When Isabella by Lorenzo knelt.

She gazed into the fresh-thrown mould, as though
 One glance did fully all its secrets tell.
 Clearly she saw, as other eyes would know,
 Pale limbs at bottom of a crystal well.
 Upon the murderous spot she seemed to grow,
 Like to a native lily of the dell;
 Then with her knife all sudden she began
 To dig more fervently than misers can.

Soon she turn'd up a soiled glove, whereon
 Her silk had play'd in purple phantasies;
 She kissed it with a lip more chill than stone,
 And put it in her bosom, where it dries
 And freezes utterly unto the bone
 Those dainties made to still an infant's cries.
 Then 'gan she work again, nor stay'd her care,
 But to throw back at times her veiling hair.'

It is difficult, though not important, to determine whether the 'Eve of St. Agnes' be next in order of time to the 'Pot of Basil.' It falls certainly within that astonishingly prolific year 1819. Though it was Spenser who kindled the spark of poetry within his soul, the stanza of the 'Faerie Queen' was but once used by him as the vehicle of his poetic creations. But in the 'Eve of St. Agnes' he makes ample compensation for this neglect, if we may call it neglect, of his first master. Of all the longer poems of Keats this is the most faultless in its versification and at the same time the most popular and generally admired. The story is founded on superstitions which grew round the Vigil of St. Agnes, according to which damsels, after certain acts of divination, saw in a dream their future husbands. The vigil falls in the very heart of winter (January 20), so picturesquely described in the first stanza:—

'St. Agnes' Eve! Ah! bitter chill it was!
 The owl, for all his feathers, was a-cold;
 The hare limp'd trembling through the frozen grass,
 And silent was the flock in woolly fold;
 Numb were the Beadsman's fingers, while he told
 His rosary, and while his frosted breath,
 Like pious incense from a censer old,
 Seem'd taking flight for heaven, without a death,
 Past the sweet Virgin's picture, while his prayer he saith.'

Madeline, the heroine of the story, is thus introduced:—

'Full of this whim was thoughtful Madeline;
 The music, yearning like a god in pain,
 She scarcely heard; her maiden eyes divine,

Fixed on the floor, saw many a sweeping train
 Pass by—she heeded not at all; in vain
 Came many a tip-toe amorous cavalier,
 And back retir'd: not cooled by high disdain,
 But she saw not; her heart was elsewhere:
 She sighed for Agnes' dreams, the sweetest of the year.'

The 'Endymion' had many glowing descriptions of woman's beauty and charms, but the chastened refinement and delicacy of the following description shows how Keats had advanced on himself:—

'Full on this casement shone the wintry moon,
 And threw warm gules on Madeline's fair breast,
 As down she knelt for heaven's grace and boon.
 Rose-bloom fell on her hands together prest,
 And on her silver cross soft amethyst,
 And on her hair a glory like a saint;
 She seemed a splendid angel newly drest,
 Save wings, for heaven;—Porphyro grew faint;
 She knelt so pure a thing, so free from mortal taint.

Anon his heart revives; her vespers done,
 Of all its wreathed pearls her hair she frees;
 Unclasps her warmed jewels one by one;
 Loosens her fragrant boddice; by degrees
 Her rich attire creeps rustling to her knees;
 Half hidden like a mermaid in sea-weed,
 Pensive awhile she dreams awake, and sees,
 In fancy, fair St. Agnes in her bed,
 But does not look behind or all the charm is fled.'

The escape of the lovers in 'the elfin storm' is a weird ending of the poem:—

'They glide, like phantoms, into the wide hall;
 Like phantoms, to the iron porch they glide,
 Where lay the porter in uneasy sprawl,
 With a huge empty flagon by his side;
 The wakeful bloodhound rose and shook his hide,
 But his sagacious eye an inmate owns;
 By one and one, the bolts full easy slide,
 The chains lie silent on the foot-worn stones;
 The key turns, and the door upon its hinges groans.

And they are gone; ay, ages long ago,
 Those lovers fled away into the storm.'

The story of 'Lamia' was taken from a book—Burton's 'Anatomy of Melancholy'—which, though a favourite one with Johnson and Byron and all lovers of quaint reading,

had never, as far as we know, set the brain of poet to work, or suggested a theme for a poem. A young man going between Cenchræa and Corinth meets a phantasm, in the habit of a fair gentlewoman, who carried him home to her house in the suburbs of Corinth, telling him she was a Phœnician by birth, and promising that if he would tarry with her, all joys and delights should ever be with him. The young man yielding to her seductions lives with her for a long time, and at last marries her. To his wedding there came Apollonius, his former master in philosophy, who discovers her to be a serpent or Lamia, and that the palace and all it contained were, like the gold of Tantalus, mere illusions. Deaf to all her entreaties to remain silent, Apollonius denounced her; whereupon she and her house and all its treasures vanished in an instant. This is the account, slightly abridged, which Keats read in that book, on which he engrafted a poetical invention worthy of the poet of 'Endymion.' In a letter to Reynolds * he tells him: 'I have proceeded pretty well with "*Lamia*," finishing the first part, which consists of about four hundred lines. . . . I have great hopes of success, because I make use of my judgement more deliberately than I have yet done; but in case of failure with the world, I shall find my content.' To his brother George he writes (September 1819): 'I have been reading over a part of a short poem I have composed lately called "*Lamia*," and I am certain there is that sort of fire in it which must take hold of people in some way—give them either pleasant or unpleasant sensations.' † The poem, like all those of the volume named the '*Lamia*' volume, shows marks of the extreme care the poet had bestowed upon it. The verse, formed on the model of Dryden, is rich, pliable, and vigorous. The story is skilfully woven and blended together into a finished, perfect, and compact whole, the action moving on from stage to stage with irresistible progress. There is no trace of the fanciful exuberance and obscurity which made the '*Endymion*' so hard to follow. The description of the Lamia before she is transformed into a fair woman's shape is singularly graphic:—

'She was a gordian shape of dazzling hue,
Vermilion-spotted, golden, green, and blue;
Striped like a zebra, freckled like a pard,
Eyed like a peacock, and all crimson barr'd:

* Forman, vol. iii. p. 312.

† Forman, vol. iv. p. 8.

And full of silver moons, that, as she breathed,
 Dissolved, or brighter shone, or interwreathed
 Their lustre with the gloomier tapestries—
 So rainbow-sided, touch'd with miseries,
 She seem'd at once some penanced lady elf,
 Some demon's mistress, or the demon's self.
 Upon her crest she wore a wannish fire,
 Sprinkled with stars, like Ariadne's tiar ;
 Her head was serpent, but ah ! bitter sweet,
 She had a woman's mouth, with all its pearls complete ;
 And for her eyes—what could such eyes do there,
 But weep and weep, that they were born so fair ?
 As Proserpine still weeps for her Sicilian air.
 Her throat was serpent, but the words she spake
 Came, as through bubbling honey, for love's sake.'

Book i. 47.

The transformation of the Lamia into a woman is described more wonderfully still :—

' Left to herself, the serpent now began
 To change ; her elfin blood in madness ran,
 Her mouth foam'd, and the grass, therewith besprent,
 Wither'd at dew so sweet and virulent ;
 Her eyes in torture fix'd, and anguish drear,
 Hot, glazed, and wide, with lid-lashes all sear,
 Flash'd phosphor and sharp sparks, without one cooling tear.
 The colours all inflamed throughout her train,
 She writhed about, convulsed with scarlet pain :
 A deep volcanian yellow took the place
 Of all her milder-mooned body's grace ;
 And, as the lava ravishes the mead,
 Spoilt all her silver mail, and golden brede ;
 Made gloom of all her frecklings, streaks and bars,
 Eclipsed her crescents, and lick'd up her stars ;
 So that, in moments few, she was undrest
 Of all her sapphires, greens, and amethyst,
 And rubious-argent : of all these bereft,
 Nothing but pain and ugliness were left.
 Still shone her crown ; that vanish'd, also she
 Melted and disappear'd as suddenly ;
 And in the air, her new voice luting soft,
 Cried " Lycius ! gentle Lycius ! "—Borne aloft
 With the bright mists about the mountains hoar
 These words dissolved : Crete's forests heard no more.'

Book i. 146.

The second part opens with a description of Lycius and his bride enthroned side by side upon a couch, from which appears 'unveiled the summer heaven, blue and clear be-

‘twixt two marble shafts.’ Suddenly there is heard a ‘thrill of trumpets:’—

‘Lycius started—the sounds fled,
But left a thought, a buzzing in his head.
For the first time, since first he harbour’d in
That purple-lined palace of sweet sin,
His spirit pass’d beyond its golden bourn
Into the noisy world almost forsworn.
The lady, ever watchful, penetrant,
Saw this with pain, so arguing a want
Of something more, more than her empery
Of joys; and she began to moan and sigh
Because he mused beyond her, knowing well
That but a moment’s thought is passion’s passing bell.’

Book ii. 27.

But Lycius, impatient to show his bride to the world, insists on a marriage-feast at which she must appear. Lamia consents with inward fear and agony of mind; but one condition she makes—Apollonius must not be invited; but at the magic feast prepared by the phantom bride, unbidden the philosopher appears:—

“Fool! Fool!” repeated he, while his eyes still
Relented not, nor moved: “from every ill
“Of life have I preserved thee to this day,
“And shall I see thee made a serpent’s prey?”
Then Lamia breathed death-breath; the sophist’s eye,
Like a sharp spear, went through her utterly,
Keen, cruel, perçant, stinging: she, as well
As her weak hand could any meaning tell,
Motion’d him to be silent; vainly so,
He look’d and look’d again a level—No!
“A Serpent!” echoed he; no sooner said,
Than with a frightful scream she vanished:
And Lycius’ arms were empty of delight,
As were his limbs of life, from that same night.
On the high couch he lay!—his friends came round—
Supported him—no pulse, or breath they found,
And, in its marriage robe, the heavy body wound.’

Book ii. 295.

Our extracts do not, and cannot, do justice to this poem. It is so compact, so firmly braced and knit together, that it becomes a matter of great difficulty to avoid disconnecting the whole while we select a part.

‘Hyperion, a Fragment,’ closes this volume; a position which no doubt it owes to the fact that, as the advertisement states, it was printed in opposition to the wishes of

the author, and on the responsibility of the publishers. But fragment though it be, it would have created a reputation for any poet in any age; and yet this noble fragment was all but suppressed by the author himself, who was constantly reproached by critics for vanity and conceit.

The theme had early attracted the attention of Keats. In the preface to 'Endymion' he said: 'I hope I have not in too late a day touched the beautiful mythology of Greece and dulled its brightness, for I wish to try once more before I bid it farewell.' The composition of 'Hyperion' was taken up, laid aside from time to time, and finally abandoned. A first sketch of it was discovered and published by Lord Houghton in the third volume of the *Memoirs of the Philobiblon Society*, and reprinted (1867) in the appendix to the amended edition of the 'Life and Letters.' Though far inferior, as we think, to the printed poem, the comparison of the two will reward the care and attention of any student of poetry. We know how Shelley admired 'Hyperion.' In the letter which he addressed, but did not send, to the Editor of the 'Quarterly,' he speaks of it 'as written in the very highest style of poetry.' In one to Peacock, dated from Pisa, he says: "'Hyperion" is certainly an astonishing piece of writing;' and again, to the same person, three months later: 'If "Hyperion" be not grand poetry, none has been produced by our contemporaries.' Byron, too, who disgraced himself by the levity of his remarks as long as Keats lived, after the death of Keats changed his tone and echoed the praises of 'Hyperion': 'His fragment of "Hyperion" seems actually inspired by the Titans, and is sublime as Æschylus.' It is difficult in expressing our deliberate opinion of this imposing fragment to avoid the appearance of exaggeration. But since Milton no greater verse has been written by any English poet; the firm, massive, stately, yet musical swell of the diction proves itself equal to the high theme of the fall of the older gods. He relinquished, indeed, the attempt; but it was not because he could not soar and maintain the height of his flight till he had finished the poem; but here, as in 'Endymion,' he had chosen a subject too remote from human interest, and which refused to be pliable even to his superb powers.

In the rich contents of this volume we find the purest specimens of the lyrical powers of Keats. He had never before shown that this species of poetry existed in him in supreme measure; but the Odes 'To a Nightingale,' 'On a Grecian Urn,' 'To Psyche'—not to mention others—

prove what a lyrist he was. It excites our amazement to find Shelley speaking by implication contemptuously of these gems. The author of the 'Ode to the Skylark' could not, surely, have read the poems, when he speaks of them as insignificant. From the 'Ode to a Nightingale' we take these faultless stanzas :—

'O for a beaker full of the warm South,
Full of the true, the blushful Hippocrene,
With beaded bubbles winking at the brim,
And purple-stained mouth ;
That I might drink, and leave the world unseen,
And with thee fade away into the forest dim :

Fade far away, dissolve, and quite forget
What thou among the leaves hast never known,
The weariness, the fever, and the fret
Here, where men sit and hear each other groan ;
Where palsy shakes a few, sad, last gray hairs,
Where youth grows pale, and spectre-thin, and dies ;
Where but to think is to be full of sorrow
And leaden-eyed despairs,
Where Beauty cannot keep her lustrous eyes,
Or new Love pine at them beyond to-morrow.

Thou wast not born for death, immortal Bird !
No hungry generations tread thee down ;
The voice I hear this passing night was heard
In ancient days by emperor and clown :
Perhaps the self-same song that found a path
Through the sad heart of Ruth, when, sick for home,
She stood in tears amid the alien corn ;
The same that oft-times hath
Charm'd magic casements, opening on the foam
Of perilous seas, in faery lands forlorn.'

We remember nothing more bold and original, yet more lovely, than these two stanzas from the 'Ode on a Grecian Urn :—

'Heard melodies are sweet, but those unheard
Are sweeter ; therefore, ye soft pipes, play on ;
Not to the sensual ear, but more endear'd,
Pipe to the spirit ditties of no tone ;
Fair youth, beneath the trees, thou canst not leave
Thy song, nor ever can those trees be bare ;
Bold lover, never, never canst thou kiss,
Though winning near the goal—yet do not grieve,
She cannot fade, though thou hast not thy bliss,
For ever wilt thou love and she be fair !

Ah! happy, happy boughs! that cannot shed
 Your leaves, nor ever bid the spring adieu;
 And happy melodist, unwearied,
 For ever piping songs for ever new;
 More happy love! more happy, happy love!
 For ever warm, and still to be enjoy'd,
 For ever panting, and for ever young;
 All breathing human passion far above,
 That leaves a heart high-sorrowful and cloy'd,
 A burning forehead, and a parching tongue.'

Lastly, from the 'Ode to Psyche'—'marvellous,' as Mr. Ruskin truly calls it—we give this stanza:—

'Yes, I will be thy priest, and build a fane
 In some untrodden region of my mind,
 Where branched thoughts, new grown with pleasant pain,
 Instead of pines shall murmur in the wind:
 Far, far around shall those dark-cluster'd trees
 Fledge the wild-ridged mountains steep by steep;
 And there by zephyrs, streams, and birds, and bees,
 The moss-lain Dryads shall be lull'd to sleep;
 And in the midst of this wide quietness
 A rosy sanctuary will I dress
 With the wreath'd trellis of a working brain,
 With buds, and bells, and stars without a name;
 With all the gardener Fancy e'er could feign,
 Who breeding flowers, will never breed the same;
 And there shall be for thee all soft delight
 That shadowy thought can win,
 A bright torch, and a casement ope at night,
 To let the warm Love in!'

But we return once more and finally to the poet himself. The 'Lamia' volume was published when Keats was, so to speak, under sentence of death. Twice he had been attacked by hæmorrhage from the lungs. His physician enjoined him to pass the winter in Italy, and it is probable that the volume was published with the hope of providing funds to meet the necessary expenses; in fact, he says as much in the letter to Shelley, from which we have already quoted. Although, however, a heartier welcome was given to this than to the preceding volumes of his poetry, the sale was slow. In the August number, 1820, of this Journal, there was an article on 'Endymion' and the 'Lamia' volume, of which it was no secret that Jeffrey was the author. This, we think, was the first distinct and favourable notice which the poetry of Keats received during his lifetime from any of the leading organs of our periodical literature. Keats himself seems to have

felt some pique, because no notice had been earlier taken of his 'Endymion.' With great bitterness he complained to George Keats that 'the "Edinburgh Review" is afraid to touch upon my poem.*' The 'Endymion' and the 'Lamia' volume are both mentioned in the heading to the article, though the critic refers almost exclusively to the former, and dismisses the merits of the other in one short paragraph at its end. The commendation meted out would, at this day, be regarded as rather cold and measured; but the genius of the poet and the spirit of the poetry which breathes 'through its extravagance' are generously recognised. 'They [the works of the poet] are flushed all over 'with the rich lights of fancy, and so coloured and bestrewn 'with the flowers of poetry, that even while perplexed and 'bewildered in their labyrinths, it is impossible to resist 'the intoxication of their sweetness or to shut our hearts to 'the enchantments they so lavishly present.' We question whether anything has ever been more justly said of 'Endymion' than what is contained in the following words:— 'We are very much indeed inclined to add, that we do not 'know a book which we would sooner employ as a test to 'ascertain whether any one had in him a native relish for 'poetry and a genuine sensibility to its intrinsic charm.' This was, considering the time at which it was written, high praise, and could not have been otherwise than most gratifying to the poet himself, if he had ever read it, which we see ground to question.

But criticisms, whether in the spirit of sympathetic admiration or of malignant detraction, must, at this crisis of his health, have ceased either to soothe or to irritate. The sorrows of heart from which he suffered were too real and too near to admit of exultation or depression from critical estimates of his works. He had to endure the pangs of separation from many true friends of his youth and manhood, and, above all, from the lady whom with a single heart he so passionately loved. It is pleasant to know that the friendship of Severn and the love of Fanny Brawne drew closer to him as his weakness increased. Separation from his betrothed, not the attacks of critics, nor the indifference of his contemporaries to his undying merits, was the pang which tortured his heart and made the prospect of death sometimes so dreadful. No one saw this more distinctly or expressed it more touchingly than the true and faithful

* Forman, vol. iv. p. 18.

Joseph Severn. In the April number of the 'Atlantic Monthly' of 1863 he published an article, singularly misnamed by himself, 'On the Vicissitudes of the Fame of Keats,' in which, among other things, he treats of the engagement of Keats and Fanny Brawne. Not that he was the first to speak in a becoming manner of this attachment: already Lord Houghton had done this in his 'Life and Letters' (vol. i. p. 148). Several years after the death of Keats, she married; but 'she has preserved the memory of Keats with a sacred honour, and it is no vain assumption that to have inspired and sustained the one passion of this noble being has been a source of delight and earnest thankfulness through the changes and chances of her mortal pilgrimage.' But Severn is yet more specific, and from his paper to which we have just alluded we borrow some interesting paragraphs.

'For more than the year I am now dwelling on, he had fostered a tender and enduring love for a young girl nearly of his own age; this love was reciprocal. It was encouraged by the sole parent of the lady, and the fond mother was happy in seeing her daughter so betrothed, and pleased that her inheritance would fall to so worthy an object as Keats. This was all well settled in the minds and hearts of the common friends of both parties, when Keats, soon after the death of his younger brother, unaccountably showed signs of consumption. By degrees it began to be deemed needful that the young poet should go to Italy, even to preserve his life. This was at last accomplished, but too late.'

'In Italy he always shrank from speaking in direct terms of the actual things that were killing him. Certainly the "Blackwood" attack was one of the least of his miseries, for he never even mentioned it to me. The greater trouble which was engulfing him he signified in a hundred ways. Was it to be wondered at that, at the time when the happiest life was presented to his view, when it was arranged that he was to marry a young person of beauty and fortune, when a little knot of friends who valued him saw such a future for the beloved poet, and he himself with generous, unselfish feeling, looked forward to it more delighted on their account—was it to be wondered at that, on the appearance of consumption, his ardent mind should have sunk into despair? He seemed struck down from the highest happiness to the lowest misery. He felt crushed at the prospect of being cut off at the early age of twenty-four, when the cup was at his lips, and he was beginning to drink that draught of delight which was to last his mortal life through, which would have insured him the happiness of home, and which was to be a barrier for him against a cold and to him a malignant world.'

Keats and Severn embarked on board the 'Maria Crowther,' which sailed from the Thames about the middle of September. Touching at Yarmouth in the Isle of Wight, Keats

wrote to his friend Brown, with this pathetic allusion to his betrothed:—

‘I think, without mentioning it, for my sake you would be a friend to Miss Brawne when I am dead. You think she has many faults, but for my sake think she has not one. . . . The thought of leaving Miss Brawne is beyond everything horrible—the sense of darkness coming over me—I eternally see her figure eternally vanishing. Some of the phrases she was in the habit of using during my last nursing at Wentworth Place ring in my ears. Is there another life? Shall I awake and find all this a dream? There must be; we cannot be created for this sort of suffering.’ (Forman, vol. iv. p. 106.)

After a long and boisterous voyage, followed by a quarantine of ten days—a terrible probation for a sufferer in an advanced stage of consumption—Keats and his companion were released from the vessel on the last day of October. While still detained in the harbour of Naples he wrote to Mrs. Brawne:—‘I dare not fix my mind upon Fanny. I have not dared to think of her. The only comfort I have had that way has been my thinking for hours together of having the knife she gave me put in a silver case; the hair in a locket; and the pocketbook in a gold net. Show her this. I dare say no more.’ A postscript is added: ‘Good bye, Fanny. God bless you.’

There are two final letters of Keats in this collection, to Charles Armitage Brown, so harrowing, yet so sacred, that we shun dragging them again into light.

The last of these was dated Rome, Nov. 30, 1820. Henceforward all the knowledge of Keats in his last hours comes to us from the devoted Severn in passages extracted from letters written by him to friends at home. It is too evident that the comfortless days passed on board the humble trader, ‘*Maria Crowther*,’ and the wear and tear of the long quarantine, told severely on the impaired constitution of Keats, even after he arrived at Rome and occupied the lodgings which Dr. Clark, well known afterwards as Sir James Clark, secured for him in the Piazza di Spagna. Nor would his frail health permit him to use the introduction which Sir Thomas Lawrence gave him to Canova. In truth he seldom or never left the house; the only change allowed him was from his bed-room to his sitting-room. ‘Oh, what an account I could give you of the Bay of Naples, if I could once feel myself a citizen of the world! I feel a spirit in my brain would lay it forth pleasantly. Oh, what a misery it is to have an intellect in splints!’ Thus he wrote to Mrs. Brawne on his arrival at Naples; but at Rome, even more than at

Naples, his intellect continued in splints. The fervour and glow of his fine style were never to be displayed in describing the beauties either of nature or of art. Had recovery been possible, 'the cautious thoughtfulness of earnest love,' which he found in Severn, and the skill so unstintingly exercised by Sir James Clark, would have arrested the progress of the fell disease. His thoughts sometimes dwelt on Wentworth Place and the few happy days he had spent at the house of Mrs. Brawne—'the only time,' as he said, 'when his mind was at 'ease.' How prostrate must his strength have been, when he was unable even to read the three letters which arrived from Fanny Brawne! The sight of them was too much for him, and Severn was requested to place them in his coffin. The thought of recovery became painful beyond expression; the hope of death, soothed by the elevating consolations of Jeremy Taylor which Severn read to him, was his only comfort. Fixing his bright, falcon eyes, which beamed with an unearthly brightness and penetrating steadfastness which could not be looked at, he would demand of Clark, 'How long 'is this posthumous life of mine to last?' On February 23 the near approach of death was visible. "'Severn, lift me 'up—I am dying—I shall die easy. Don't be frightened. 'Be firm, and thank God that it has come.'" He gradually 'sank into death, that I still thought he slept.' On the 26th of February all that was mortal of John Keats was laid in the Protestant cemetery at Rome, a spot so retired and lovely that Shelley said it made one in love with death to think one should be buried in so sweet a place. On the tombstone at the head of the grave has been carved the inscription he himself desired: 'Here lies one whose name 'is writ in water:' words which the love and admiration of thousands have already fondly but impressively denied, and which, in generations to come, will receive a yet more signal refutation.

Mr. Forman deserves great credit for the care and diligence with which he has collected the letters of Keats. This collection embraces those which Lord Houghton had previously published, with many additions which have rewarded Mr. Forman's indefatigable search and enquiry. It fills the third and a considerable portion of the fourth volume of his edition. That the epistolary style of poets is especially happy and excellent is no novel remark. The letters of Gray, of Cowper, of Byron, prove and exemplify this assertion. We claim this distinction also for Keats. His letters will always remain the best elucidations of his poems.

They show how they arose in his mind; the sorrows and difficulties amid which they were written; and they will be cited increasingly for the felicity, the humour, and the eloquence of their style. At the conclusion of this long article we must not presume to make any extensive extracts; a very few only can be permitted. The writer of such prose as we exhibit in the few following lines has not wandered far from his noblest poetic domain. To the sister of his friend Reynolds he writes:—

‘In truth, the great elements we know of are no mean comforters: the open sky sits upon our senses like a sapphire crown; the air is our robe of state; the earth is our throne, and the sea a mighty minstrel playing before it—able, like David’s harp, to make such as you forget almost the tempest cares of life.’ (Forman, vol. iii. p. 70.)

What noble moral purpose is expressed in these words!—

‘I find there is no worthy pursuit but the idea of doing some good to the world. Some do it with their society; some with their wit; some with their benevolence; some with a sort of power of conferring pleasure and good humour on all they meet; and in a thousand ways all dutiful to the command of great nature. There is but one way for me: the road lies through application, study, and thought. I will pursue it.’ (Vol. iii. p. 147.)

Gladly would we take leave of Mr. Forman with sincere respect for his labour of love in editing this, in every sense, complete edition of the poems and letters of Keats. It is a worthy monument raised by him to the memory of the poet. But one exception to our general commendation we must make and note. Mr. Forman published in 1877 the love-letters of Keats to Fanny Brawne, and has included them in the present edition. But, in common with many other admirers of the poet, we regard this publication and republication as a violation of the duties of a biographer—an act of sacrilege to the memory of Keats. No man, surely, should know more intimately than Mr. Forman the abhorrence with which Keats would have viewed any such prostitution of the secrets of his love. As if this were not enough, we see while we write these words that the love-letters of John Keats to Fanny Brawne have been sold by public auction. This act of desecration—for such we hold it to be—is evidently a consequence of the publication of those feverish letters which certainly never were intended to see the light or to be sold as curiosities.

- ART. II.—1. *Giuseppe Pasolini*. Memorie raccolte da suo figlio. 2a Edizione. Imola: 1881.
2. *Memoirs of Count Pasolini, late President of the Senate of Italy*. Compiled by his Son. Translated and abridged by the DOWAGER COUNTESS OF DALHOUSIE. London: 1885.
3. *Italy, from the Fall of Napoleon in 1815 to the Death of Victor Emmanuel in 1878*. By JOHN WEBB PROBYN. London: 1884.

THE history of Europe, during the last seventy years, has been constantly affected by two great popular movements. One of them has been prompted by the passionate desire of the people of almost every European country for self-rule, the other by the anxiety of men of the same race and of the same language to fuse themselves under a common government. These two movements have led to many of the struggles and to some of the victories of the century. They have been responsible, on the one hand, for revolutions and for crimes, but they have been distinguished, on the other hand, by deeds and words which will not be easily forgotten. In some instances, of which Poland is the most conspicuous example, they have been extinguished by the fire and the sword; in others, of which Italy is the most noteworthy instance, they have been crowned with the palms of victory.

There can be very little doubt that the arrangements made in 1815 were responsible for the great popular movements which thus subsequently occurred. The autocratic sovereigns assembled at Vienna, sedulous to preserve peace by strengthening their own power, gave no heed to the aspirations of the people. Belgium was incorporated in Holland; Poland was left to the mercy of the powers who had divided it among themselves; Lombardy and Venice were allotted to Austria; and the rest of Italy was assigned to Austrian archdukes, the Pope, and the Neapolitan Bourbons. The alliance which Madame Krudener suggested, and which Alexander of Russia succeeded in forming, apparently made it hopeless for any people to dispute the will of the absolute monarchs of Europe; and, though peace was occasionally disturbed by popular uprisings and the movements of armies, the map of Europe remained unaltered for nearly fifteen years.

Four months before the great battle which enabled the statesmen of Europe to dictate the settlement of 1815, Giuseppe Pasolini dall' Onda was born at Ravenna. He died at the same town in December, 1876. He thus grew up to manhood at a period when Italy was only 'a geographical expression;' he lived to see his country a great and united nation. The part which he was destined to take in giving freedom to his fellow-countrymen will not secure him any very prominent place in the history of the century. But, if he cannot be reckoned among his country's foremost men, he shared the views and enjoyed the close friendship of many of her leading statesmen. The friend both of Pio Nono and Antonelli, of Victor Emmanuel and of Cavour, he was at different periods entrusted with the confidence both of Pope and King. His liberal opinions, his prudent conduct, and his undoubted honesty gave peculiar value to his counsels and his services.

Such was the man whose memoir, written by his son, and published a few years ago at Imola, has now been translated into English by Lady Dalhousie. We hope that it may find many readers in this country. The story of the struggle in which Italy won her freedom is well worth telling, and in this memoir the student will find much information not elsewhere procurable in our own language. We have occasionally, indeed, in reading the book, regretted that its author had not made his historical narrative a little more full. But perhaps this circumstance was inevitable. A work written for Italians, relating to modern Italian history, presumes, almost necessarily, an acquaintance with Italian politics which no ordinary Englishman can possess. Anyone, however, who desires to supply the void which he may detect in Lady Dalhousie's volume, may turn with advantage to the other work whose title we have placed at the head of this article. The period which Mr. Probyn has selected almost exactly corresponds with that which is covered by Count Pasolini's life. Though Mr. Probyn does not pretend to have compiled an exhaustive history, his work may safely be recommended as an honest and faithful narrative of a great national revolution, and we shall avail ourselves of his labours, as well as those of Lady Dalhousie, to illustrate one or two chapters of modern Italian history.

For more than thirty years after 1815, the arrangements made at Vienna were undisturbed in Italy. The risings

which occurred in Naples and Piedmont in 1820, and in the Romagna and in Modena in 1830, were stamped out by Austrian intervention. Thenceforward, till 1846, revolution seemed hopeless. Austria had proved both her capacity and her will to maintain authority; and the union and freedom of Italy seemed equally unattainable. Arbitrary rulers, bent on stamping out revolution and reform, are apt to drive reformers and republicans into secret combinations. The Neapolitan rising of 1820 was both inspired and sustained by the Carbonari. Some years later a young Italian, 'Joseph Mazzini by name, conceived the idea of a 'new association to be called Young Italy.' Some English readers may have recently derived a new idea of Mazzini's character from the admirable letters which he addressed to Mrs. Carlyle in her hour of difficulty and distress. In Mr. Probyn's pages he is a 'man of singularly pure and moral 'life,' possessing 'a marvellous power of personal attraction 'and influence.' He desired to unite all Italians in the common object of making their country at once free, united, and republican. Many Italians were ready enough to join hands with Mazzini; but many others, though they shared some of his views, dissented from a portion of his teaching, and distrusted his detestable, and sometimes sanguinary, plots. Moderate reformers themselves, they had no desire to replace autocracy with anarchy; and they believed that all reasonable objects could be secured by milder measures than those which Mazzini was suggesting. Instead of a rising against authority and the establishment of an Italian republic, they advocated constitutional reforms and a federation of Italian States. These views were developed in the 'Primato morale e civile degl' Italiani' by the Abate Vincenzo Gioberti; they were supported by Cesare Balbo in the 'Speranze d' Italia;' and they were reasserted by Massimo d'Azeglio in his 'Casi di Romagna.'

These and other works of the same character were raising among educated Italians new ideas and new hopes of Italian unity. The future of Italy depended—so these writers taught—on Piedmont and Rome. The former, the best governed of Italian States, was the centre of Italian force; the latter, both in its past and present history, was the centre of Italian faith. But, while the hopes of moderate reformers were fixed on Rome, the condition of the Papal Government filled them with despair. Supported by the presence of Swiss troops and by the active encouragement

of Austria, the Pope was enabled to resist all change and to maintain all abuses.

‘In Romagna,’ wrote D’Azeglio, ‘a set of wretches are maintained, the lowest and worst characters . . . who howl out that they are devoted to religion, the Pope and his government. With this cry they claim exemption from all restraint, and think themselves authorised to commit every sort of violence against those who profess different opinions.’

‘Laws,’ wrote Mr. Freeborn, the British consular agent at Rome, ‘laws criminal and civil require reform, and this reform is pressed upon the Government by all classes of the people. The administration is not good. . . . The finances are in a deplorable state. . . . The Government could not stand without the protection of Austria and the immediate presence of the Swiss.’*

Such was the state of Italy and of the Romagna in the concluding years of Gregory XVI. At that time Count Pasolini was residing on his estate at Montericco near Imola. Count Pasolini had inherited liberal opinions from his father, who had been at one time Podestà of Ravenna.† In these views he had been partly confirmed by his marriage, in 1843, with Antonietta Bassi, a young lady of Lombardy, whose father held a distinguished position in Milan during the revolution of 1848. Like most liberal Italians, the Pasolinis were brooding over the evils to which the Romagna was a prey, and reading with avidity the works of Gioberti, of Balbo, and of D’Azeglio. The See of Imola was, at that time, filled by Cardinal Mastai, as Count Pasolini calls him, or (to give him his fuller name) by Cardinal Mastai Ferretti, who was destined soon afterwards to become Pio Nono. The future Pope had been a missionary in Chili; he enjoyed the reputation of possessing ‘liberal and moderate opinions and ‘a correct judgement,’ and he had no tolerance for the misgovernment of the Papal States, or for the reactionary policy of the Vatican.

‘I cannot understand,’ to quote his own words, ‘the captiousness of our Government in liking to persecute the rising generation, who must needs breathe the air of the present century rather than that of

* Correspondence respecting Italy. Parliamentary Papers, 1849, p. 16. We have used the voluminous correspondence on the affairs of Italy in our Parliamentary Papers to illustrate Count Pasolini’s memoir, as well as an excellent chapter on ‘L’Italie et le pape Pie IX’ in the last volume of Guizot’s ‘Mémoires.’ Those of our readers who may wish for further light on the Radical side of the question should consult Garnier-Pagès’ ‘Histoire de la Révolution de 1848.’

the past. It would be so easy to gratify their aspirations and to win their love. . . . There is nothing contrary to theology, that I know of, in the advancement of science, industry, and art.'

He had already read the '*Casi di Romagna.*' Madame Pasolini lent him the '*Speranze d' Italia.*' Count Pasolini gave him the '*Primato morale e civile degl' Italiani,*' and enforced the moral of the work by adding that, whether Gioberti's proposition for a confederation of Italian States was the dream of a poet or the prophecy of a sage, disorder in this world could be neither irremediable nor eternal. Cardinal Ferretti listened and approved; he fancied 'that he 'discerned in the dark and stormy present some dawning of 'peace and light to come.' He could hardly have been expected to foresee that the light which he was destined to kindle he was fated also to extinguish.

On June 1, 1846, Gregory XVI. died, and Cardinal Ferretti was summoned to Rome to take part in the election of a new Pope. 'There is a story told of a white pigeon perching 'on Mastai's carriage during his journey, and returning again 'after being several times driven away.*' We have more interest in observing that the Cardinal carried with him to the conclave 'the works of Gioberti and other books of liberal 'and enlightened principles, which he intended presenting 'to the new Pope.' Perhaps, even after what we have said of these works, an English reader may fail to appreciate the significance of the circumstance. But its importance may be inferred from a despatch in which Mr. Freeborn, the British consular agent at Rome, announced the death of Gregory XVI. and the deplorable condition of the States of the Church. 'If the new Pope,' wrote Mr. Freeborn, 'continues extreme severity with political delinquents, and refuses 'all reform or improvement, the country will not remain 'tranquil. The works of Gioberti, Balbo, and Massimo 'd'Azeglio have been read with avidity.' On the day after this despatch was written, after the shortest conclave since 1572, Cardinal Ferretti was chosen Pope. The choice of the conclave had thus fallen on a prelate who had been reading liberal publications at least as eagerly as his future subjects.

* The white pigeon reappeared a year afterwards when the Pope was pronouncing a benediction from the balcony of the Vatican, and was saluted by the crowd as an emblem of the Holy Spirit. After all, neither the omen nor its application was more absurd than Louis-Napoleon's eagle.

And liberal reading led to liberal conduct. A month after his election the Pope granted an amnesty to political offenders. A few weeks later, in August 1846, Cardinal Gizzi, a prelate whose mild and conciliatory manners made him universally popular, was appointed Secretary of State, and other reforms were either granted or promised.

Yet the new Pope, though his popularity was daily increasing, was already beset with a double danger. The party of Young Italy, which Mazzini had formed, was impatient of a policy which was fatal to the success of its own views. Its members had pledged themselves to an Italian republic and the expulsion of the Austrians, and the concession of partial reforms was, of course, likely to satisfy some of its adherents, and so diminish its resources. There was another party in Rome, too, which regarded with even greater dislike the reforming policy of the new Pope. The Sanfedisti, or partisans of the Holy Faith, were equally hostile to republicanism and constitutional monarchy. They believed that moderate reform inevitably led to the extreme results which Mazzini was advocating, and that the true policy of the Pope lay in resisting all change. If they had stood alone, they would have had no chance of withstanding the movement which popular writers had initiated, and which Pio Nono was himself supporting. But their position was strengthened by the passive or even active support which they received from Austria. To Metternich a liberal Pope seemed as impossible as a United Italy.

If, however, Pio Nono found that his measures were opposed by the Sanfedisti at Rome, and by Metternich at Vienna, he soon derived fresh encouragement from the moral support which he received from the two great Western Powers. The foreign policy of France was, at that time, directed by M. Guizot. In England, soon after the election of Pio Nono, the Peel Ministry broke up, and Lord Palmerston resumed the seals of the Foreign Office. England had no diplomatic intercourse with Rome in 1846, whereas France had the advantage of being represented there by M. Rossi. There are Englishmen still alive who enjoyed the acquaintance of that able man; there are many other Englishmen who are probably familiar with the description of him which lives in M. Guizot's pages. An Italian by birth, a Frenchman by office, a Liberal in politics and religion, M. Rossi threw the whole weight of his influence into the party of Reform. In the course of 1847 his advice

was strengthened by the support which he derived from Lord Minto's presence at Rome. Whatever differences may have existed between the French and English Foreign Offices either in Spain or elsewhere, in Italy their representatives pursued an identical policy. They urged the Pope to persevere in the course of moderate reform; they helped him to resist the pressure of Prince Metternich and the Sanfedisti.

Encouragement of this sort Pio Nono already required. The roar of the Radicals on the one hand, the threats of the Sanfedisti on the other, filled the Pope's mind with vague apprehensions. The ecclesiastics by whom he was surrounded joined with Austria in opposing reform. Cardinal Gizzi, finding his authority decreasing, pressed his resignation on his master; and Pio Nono, destitute of suitable advisers, and harassed with anxiety and doubt, recollected the conversations which he had enjoyed with Count Pasolini in Imola, and, in the beginning of 1847, begged his old friend to come and help him in Rome.

One result of Pasolini's presence was to confirm Pio Nono in his determination to form a State Council of persons nominated by himself, but popular in their own neighbourhood. Pasolini was naturally selected as Councillor for Ravenna. But this measure, which was received with extraordinary rejoicings in the first instance, went but a little way to satisfy real reformers. The Council, originated in April 1847, did not assemble till the following autumn, and, in the interval, riots in the provinces increased the Pope's anxiety, and induced Metternich to strengthen the Austrian garrison at Ferrara. The anniversary of the Pope's amnesty, moreover, became an occasion for disorder; and the Pope, constrained in consequence to prohibit public meetings, lost some of his popularity.

Unluckily, too, when the Council met, it proved powerless for good. Its members, indeed, displayed a conscientious diligence. Pasolini himself undertook to report on the administration of the provincial hydraulic works, on house taxes and direct taxes, on government arrangements for the general business of the country, on the condition of the ports, and on the regulation of shores and embankments. But these Herculean labours produced no results. The Council, as Pasolini himself soon found, was 'neither an advising nor a legislative body, and therefore radically defective.'

In truth, it was impossible for any council to do anything. Between the Council and the Pope stood the Ministry; and,

till the spring of 1848, the Ministers were all ecclesiastics. M. Rossi had already traced the causes of misrule to the exclusive character of the Government, and had urged the Pope, in the preceding July, to admit at least two laymen to his Cabinet. The events, which rapidly succeeded one another in 1848, forced the Pope partially to yield. In the first days of January, disturbances broke out at Milan. About the same time the people rose in Sicily, defeated the royal troops, and insisted on obtaining the Constitution of 1812. At the end of January insurrection was only avoided in Naples by the promise of a similar concession; in the succeeding month the Piedmontese, following the prevailing example, demanded and obtained representative institutions; while in Rome, as in all Italy, the people, almost wild with excitement, shouted approval of the reforms which had already been granted, and clamoured for other similar measures.

It was in the midst of this prevailing agitation that the Pope took a tardy and tentative step towards realising the policy which both France and England were pressing on him. He appointed Prince Gabrielli, a military man, Minister at War. The appointment gave universal satisfaction. The Romans regarded it much as Pio Nono himself regarded it. 'Ebbene, Signor Conte,' so he said to M. Rossi, 'l' elemento laico è introdotto.' It was no doubt something to introduce the lay element into the Papal Ministry. But M. Rossi saw at once that the tentative measure would go a very little way. 'J'espère encore,' so he replied to the Pope, 'que la première suffira; mais elle suffira surtout si on sait bien qu'au besoin la seconde ne manquerait pas. Il faut au moins trois ministres laïques.' A few days' experience confirmed the truth of M. Rossi's opinion. Early in February the people, learning or suspecting that the Ministers intended to thwart the Pope's action, gathered in the Corso and clamoured for the downfall of the Government. Pio Nono, yielding to the uproar, decided on adopting M. Rossi's advice, and on at once appointing three laymen to the Ministry; and he named, among the three, his old friend Count Pasolini to the department of Agriculture and Commerce.

Pasolini entered on his task with some hesitation. He felt from the first that the heterogeneous elements of which the Cabinet was composed threatened its stability; while, though he retained his high opinion of Pio Nono's character, he was already a little doubtful of his master's vigour.

Events, moreover, moving at railway speed, fanned the excitement of the populace and increased the difficulties of the Government. The revolution in France and the flight of Louis-Philippe and M. Guizot were rapidly succeeded by popular uprisings throughout Europe. Prince Metternich was forced to fly from Vienna; the Austrians were driven from Venice, and the Lombards, rising against the garrison, maintained for six days the memorable struggle in the streets of Milan which forced Radetzky towards the end of March to withdraw into the Quadrilateral. These grave events produced fresh excitement in Rome; and Pio Nono, surprised to find that the concessions which he had already made were leading to fresh demands, lamented the ingratitude of his subjects and the disappointment of his expectations. On Pasolini's strong remonstrance, he was induced at the beginning of March to reconstitute his Ministry. Cardinal Bofondi was succeeded as President of the Council by Cardinal Antonelli. At Pasolini's suggestion a young statesman, Marco Minghetti, one of the most capable of Italian Ministers, was admitted to the Cabinet. The lay element, as Mr. Probyn has pointed out, actually preponderated in the reconstituted Ministry. But these concessions, which would have satisfied popular expectation in January, passed almost without notice in March. The people in January had demanded men; in March they were asking for measures, and for the sternest of all measures—war.

‘When the news of the revolution in Vienna was published in Rome on March 21, a great tumult arose. The bells rang loud peals. The Austrian colours were hauled down and burned in the Piazza del Popolo, to the cry of “Italy, Italy for ever!” The Government . . . determined to form an army . . . and began to enter volunteers, of whom Colonel Ferrari was to be commandant. To the banners of all the Pontifical troops they added the national tricolor, and the Piedmontese general, Giovanni Durando, was chosen commander-in-chief of the whole army. . . . All Rome, intoxicated with joy, rang with the clash of arms and the music of warlike songs. The Pope and the religious congregations presented large gifts for Italy. . . . More than 12,000 volunteers went out from the States of the Church, among whom were two of the Pope's nephews . . . and the Pope blessed them all as brave defenders of the Roman territory. . . . General Durando reported the extreme ardour of his volunteers to cross the Po in order to commence offensive operations.’

In the opinion of Pio Nono's Ministry, only one course was possible under these circumstances. When Papal volunteers, blessed by the Pope, were marching under the Italian tricolor to the Po, the die was practically cast, and, for

good or for evil, war seemed inevitable. But, while his ministers were urging war, the Pope was waiting for more news. While ministers were pressing for a decision, the Pope was professing a desire to be guided by circumstances; and so, while Austria was striving to gain time, and Radetzky was reorganising his beaten army, the Papal troops remained stationary at Ferrara, and failed to throw into the balance the additional weight which might have turned the scale.*

Towards the end of April the Ministry learned that the Pope intended to deliver an allocution on the war, and addressed to the Pontiff a long State paper on the subject. The Pope, by an odd reasoning, they argued had to decide the matter as Head of the Church and Head of the State. As Head of the Church they left him to be guided by the inspiration of God. As Head of the State they declared 'war to be, at this juncture, the least of possible evils, and 'the only means of restoring to troubled Italy that natural 'and lasting peace which is the attribute of a justly acquired 'nationality;' and, in laying the declaration before the Pope, 'they intimated that they would resign if he declared himself against war.'

This attitude of the Ministry placed Pio Nono in great embarrassment. He could not afford to part from his advisers, and he could not bring himself to plunge into the whirlpool of war. He urged Count Pasolini to fear nothing; he promised that his ministers should be satisfied by his policy, and he proceeded to draw up the allocution, on which he was determined, 'in Latin of such involved construction that at first no one could understand the sentences.' But one sentence soon became plain enough to all who read it. War with Austria the Pope declared to be 'abhorrent from our counsels,' and Count Pasolini and his colleagues, on realising the full meaning of this fatal declaration, at once resigned office.

The history of the next few days is not creditable to Pio Nono. He professed distress and astonishment at the interpretation which ministers had put on his words. He declared that since the Romans did not understand Latin, he must speak Italian; and he induced his ministers to

* As a matter of fact, General Durando at last crossed the Po on his own responsibility. But the movement was disavowed by the Pope, and the troops declared rebels. See the Correspondence relating to the affairs of Italy, Part II. p. 421.

remain at their posts by promising a new clearer and more satisfactory utterance. If Count Pasolini be not misinformed, he actually wrote a paper declaring that though he could not make war as Pontiff, he could not decline to assist his subjects as Prince; and he sent twice for the proof-sheets to show the draft of this paper to Count Pasolini. But the proofs never came. A stronger hand than that of Pio Nono undertook the work of revising them. Cardinal Antonelli, intercepting the document, corrected it in his own way; and Pasolini and M. Minghetti, finding the Pope still opposed to war, insisted on retiring from the administration.

The Pope's allocution—the fatal allocution, as the friends of Italy called it—justified and explained the step. The determination of the Pope to take no part in the war not merely paralysed the Papal contingent, but it withdrew from the Italian cause the moral support of the Pope's assistance. The Austrian ambassador, well aware of the consequences, said almost openly of his Holiness, 'We have caught him now;' and, in fact, Radetzky was enabled, soon afterwards, to strike the blow which restored Austrian authority to Lombardy for another eleven years. The Ministry itself rapidly dispersed. Cardinal Antonelli, who was succeeded by Count Mamiani, remained, indeed, at Rome. But M. Minghetti passed to the Piedmontese camp, and took his place in the ranks of the Piedmontese army, while Count Pasolini shortly afterwards moved to Florence, 'whence he anxiously watched the progress of Roman affairs.' They were by no means happy. Count Mamiani held the reins of government, but he did not enjoy the Pope's confidence. Irresolute and vacillating as usual, surrounded by advisers whom he did not trust, Pio Nono again turned to his old friend, and sent message after message urging Count Pasolini to return to Rome. The Count came, and obtained from the Pope authority to entrust M. Minghetti with the formation of a ministry. M. Minghetti had a plain answer.

'The dark and heavy question in my eyes is that of the war. Why have we stumbled? Because, when we wished for war, and had promoted it with all our strength, the Pope deemed fit, as a conscientious duty, solemnly to protest against it. In consequence of his act we drew back, and all Italy knows it. Now, is the mind of his Holiness changed on this subject? Is the allocution still in force? or has it been with equal solemnity annulled? Can the Ministry oppose Austria openly and freely? Yes or no? This is the question. If we have

to resume the reins of government under similar conditions to those in which we gave them up on May 1, I answer that my honour and my conscience forbid me to accept.'

For one moment it seemed possible that the Pope might yield. On July 14, two days after that on which M. Minghetti was writing his letter, the Austrians under Prince Lichtenstein crossed the Po and occupied Ferrara. The Pope told Count Pasolini that 'the question was obviously changed if the facts of Ferrara constituted a real aggression, and that he desired to defend himself. I encouraged him in this sense, entreating him . . . to call his people to arms in defence of their country. I told him that this is the right moment to make war.' But the Count's resolute advice was followed, as usual, by irresolute action. The Pope declined to do anything without enquiring into the facts; and Prince Lichtenstein afforded him an excuse for inaction by withdrawing from Ferrara. The Roman Chambers called for war; the mob of Rome clamoured for war, and Pio Nono had no answer for mob or Chambers but to invoke the benediction of God on the cause of Italy.

And, in fact, the Pope in July had other reasons for refusing war than those which had weighed with him in February. In the interval a counter-revolution in Naples had enabled the King to withdraw his Neapolitan troops from the north. Piedmont and Lombardy alone stood in arms against the Austrian battalions, and on the field of Custozza proved no match for Marshal Radetzky's soldiers. The Papal forces would have no longer been able to influence the result, even if they had been tardily authorised to take part in the campaign. Yet the Pope had to do something; his Ministry enjoyed neither his own confidence nor that of his people; and, on Count Pasolini's advice, he decided on asking M. Rossi to form a ministry. M. Rossi undertook the task. But the Sanfedisti complained that his wife was a Protestant, that he was a member of the French Academy, and that some of his works were in the Index. Attacked by the press, ill-supported by the Pope, M. Rossi abandoned, for a time, the duty which had been entrusted to him. Two months afterwards, however, in September, amidst the increasing difficulties of the situation, he was persuaded to resume the work and form his ill-fated ministry.

The administration of M. Rossi was terminated on November 15 by the assassination of the minister in the Palace of the Legislature; and with his murder the last hope of

forming constitutional government in Rome was extinguished.

‘As the news of the assassination spread, the city seemed overwhelmed with terror, though some misguided men rejoiced in the crime. . . . The Pope had lost confidence in those around him, and became more than ever inclined to leave Rome. On the night of November 24, 1848, he quitted the city dressed as a simple priest, and went to Mola di Gaeta, where he took up his residence under the protection and in the territory of King Ferdinand of Naples.’

Rome deserted by its Pontiff fell into the hands of the Republicans. A constituent assembly, elected in defiance of the Pope’s brief, assembled in February 1849, declared the Papacy to be fallen in fact and in right, and established a Roman Republic. The Roman Republic, a few months afterwards, was terminated by French intervention.

Thus, in the spring of 1849, the visions of a free and united Italy, which had cheered and dazzled Italians in the spring of 1848, had faded into nothingness. Austria had re-established her grip on Lombardy; Bomba had resumed his brutal sway in Naples; the Pope, restored to power by French bayonets, was pursuing, on Austrian advice, an autocratic policy; and even Piedmont, crushed by Custozza and Novara and the losses and the burdens of a fruitless war, was incapacitated from striking a fresh blow in the Italian cause. Venice alone, under the guidance of her great statesman, Daniele Manin, still held out against the Austrians; and, before the summer had closed, Venice was forced to yield in the unequal contest. The men who had gathered round Pio Nono in 1847 were scattered throughout Italy, and Pasolini retired to a villa near Florence, which was always open to ‘honourable and generous Italians.’ There, in 1856, he received Lord Minto and Lord Russell.

‘Lord Minto and Lord J. Russell are here in Florence,’ so he wrote to M. Minghetti. ‘The former is enthusiastic for Italy, though I know not whether his views are clear, or whether he is likely to find out the truth. Lord J. Russell is very different, but I am not able to tell you anything of him as yet.’

Ten days later, he again wrote to M. Minghetti, urging him to call on the English minister.

‘I am anxious you should see him. Many politicians are buzzing about him; but, after all their talk, my belief is that he has made up his mind there is nothing to be done. Minto is not of the same opinion. It must be remembered that the Italian question has become popular in England, and, supposing it served to bring on a ministerial crisis, the popularity of it would be enormously increased.’

We shall have occasion, later on, to trace the further developement of Lord J. Russell's opinion on the Italian question. In 1856 he was, at least, right in concluding that nothing was to be done in central Italy. The hopes of the Italians were fixed not on Rome but on Piedmont; and Lady Dalhousie's volume, from 1848 to 1860, has rather a personal than a political interest.

It is probably unnecessary to trace the history of Piedmont during this period with the same minuteness with which we have followed the policy of the Vatican from 1846 to 1848. The latter is almost unknown to English readers; the former, in its salient features at any rate, is understood in this country. And there are few passages in modern European history which deserve more attention from the historical student. In May 1849, Piedmont, apparently crushed by disaster, opened, under a new sovereign and a new minister, a new page in her annals. Happily for her fortunes, the sovereign was Victor Emmanuel, whom Italy still remembers as the honest king. The minister was D'Azeglio, the author of the 'Casi di Romagna.'

D'Azeglio had not been a year in office when he decided on 'abolishing the special ecclesiastical jurisdiction to which 'the clergy were alone amenable both in civil and criminal 'cases.'

'The law was passed, but it aroused such fierce hostility on the part of a large section of the clergy that, when Santa Rosa, the Minister of Commerce, died soon after, he was refused the last sacraments. . . . The vacant portfolio was offered by D'Azeglio to Count Cavour with the approbation of the King, who shrewdly remarked with a smile to his Prime Minister, "Look out what you are doing; Cavour will soon "be master of you all."'

The prediction proved the acuteness of Victor Emmanuel's vision. In November 1852 fresh ecclesiastical legislation produced another ministerial crisis. D'Azeglio fell; and, after a fruitless attempt to form a Conservative Ministry under Balbo, Cavour became Prime Minister.

Cavour—we are summarising Mr. Probyn's account—

'set himself at once to carry out financial, military, and ecclesiastical reforms. The war had cost Piedmont about 300,000,000 francs. The interest on her debt before the war was about 5,000,000 francs; it had risen to about 30,000,000 francs. Her population was about 5,000,000, her resources limited and but little developed, her yearly expenditure nearly doubled. Cavour built his whole financial system on a free-trade basis, of which he was an avowed advocate. He concluded commercial treaties of a very liberal character with England, Belgium,

Holland, Switzerland, and France; nor did he hesitate to act on the principle that the best way to meet hostile tariffs was by free-trade legislation. While pursuing his policy of fiscal reform he favoured in every way the spirit of individual and associated enterprise. He pushed on the railway communication of the kingdom. He was already in consultation with eminent engineers touching the project of a tunnel under the Mont Cenis. He aided national enterprise by lowering the duties on articles of first necessity to manufacturers and agriculturists. He favoured the commercial marine by the repeal of antiquated restrictions. His commercial treaties were framed with the object of obtaining the freest intercourse with other countries. The more free that intercourse the better he was pleased. Military reform was left to the Minister of War, General La Marmora, who proved himself an organiser and administrator of no ordinary skill. Ecclesiastical reforms offered a yet harder task, which was not less resolutely undertaken and performed. The special privileges of ecclesiastics were finally abolished, and the clergy, like all other citizens, were made amenable to the ordinary tribunals. Civil marriage was established, mendicant and other orders were suppressed, or their numbers lessened. A special fund was created out of the revenues of the orders abolished, and was employed for the benefit of the parochial clergy, of those engaged in education, and other religious bodies who were rendering really useful service.

Such was the outline of the domestic legislation of this great minister. His foreign policy was even more remarkable. It perhaps is open to the criticism of selfishness. Italy, and Italy alone, was its object. It was for the sake of Italy that he involved his country in the dangers and in the glories of the Crimean war. It was with the object of bringing the case of Italy before the Great Powers that he took his seat in the Congress of Paris. It was with the hope of securing the aid of France that he favoured the marriage of Princess Clotilde with Prince Napoleon. While the negotiations for the marriage were in progress, Pasolini happened to pay a visit to Turin, when he was introduced to Cavour at La Marmora's table. Pasolini had lived so long in quiet retirement at Florence and Ravenna that he had no idea that a wide and rapid 'political movement' was spreading and maturing in the heart of Italy. He felt, so his son tells us, like a man 'suddenly awakened to the sight of the avalanche ready to fall upon him,' when Cavour, as he sat down opposite to him, said, 'Now we have it; the marriage has been made on purpose. We make sure of aid from France, and all Italy is ripe for revolution.' A few months afterwards Napoleon III. was making his memorable new year's speech to the Austrian Ambassador, and Victor Emmanuel was greeting his Parlia-

ment with the significant sentences: 'Our country, though small in territory, has acquired credit in the councils of Europe, because it is great by the ideas it represents and by the sympathies it inspires. This state of things is not devoid of perils, for while we respect treaties we are not insensible to the cry of grief which comes up to us from so many parts of Italy.' A few months later still Magenta and Solferino had liberated Lombardy, while the Treaty of Villafranca had arrested the Franco-Italian battalions in the moment of their victory.

Pasolini met Cavour at Turin after the signature of the treaty. He was 'overflowing with rage against Louis Napoleon. . . . "Was he tired, or was it too hot for him?" he roared, throwing the inkstand violently aside.' His annoyance was so great that, as Mr. Probyn reminds us, he retired from office, and was succeeded by La Marmora. The terms of the treaty justified his annoyance. Of all the benefits which the war had secured, nothing was left to Italy but a liberated Lombardy. Central Italy had shaken off the domination of Pope and Grand Duke, and Central Italy was to be restored to its old masters. Venice and Milan 'had been linked together in all the changes, hopes, and trials of the last sixty years,' and Venice was 'left beneath the dominion of the foreigner. No Milanese, indeed no Italian, desired any settlement of Italy that did not include within it the freedom of Venice.'

The feeling which was thus aroused in Italy and elsewhere was so strong that Napoleon had partially to give way. He 'made it clearly understood that he would not by force restore the rulers of Tuscany, Modena, and the Roman Legations, nor would he allow others to use force for that purpose. The matter was to be left to the free choice of the citizens of those States. . . . Each of these provinces proceeded to elect representative assemblies which voted with complete unanimity against the restoration of their old rulers, and in favour of union with Piedmont and Lombardy. . . . The Emperor of the French tried in vain to persuade them that it would be best to restore the old rulers. In London, the Cabinet of Lord Palmerston declared very decidedly in favour of carrying out the wishes so clearly expressed by the populations of Central Italy.'

Northern and Central Italy were thus incorporated in one kingdom under the constitutional rule of Victor Emmanuel. Cavour returned to office, and Italians understood that they owed as much to the moral support which they had received from the English Cabinet as to the active intervention of the Emperor of the French. We have no space to describe, in

this article, the negotiations which transferred Savoy and Nice from Piedmont to France, or the victorious campaign in which Garibaldi conquered the Two Sicilies for the kingdom of Italy. We are anxious to pass on from circumstances with which most Englishmen are familiar, to passages in Pasolini's memoir with which English readers are less generally acquainted. In March 1860, Pasolini was nominated to the Senate, of which he became at once Vice-President, and later on in the same year, on the resignation of D'Azeglio, he was selected as Governor of Milan.

Pasolini remained at Milan from the autumn of 1860 to the spring of 1862; and there is ample evidence in Lady Dalhousie's pages that his administration was both popular and efficient. During this period, Italy lost the great statesman who, with a short interval, had conducted her government for eleven years. Cavour is universally recognised as one of the few great statesmen and diplomatists which the nineteenth century has produced. His power may perhaps be seen by comparing the stability of his administration with the instability of his successors. Cavour was succeeded by Ricasoli; in nine months Ricasoli was replaced by Ratazzi; in eight months more Ratazzi gave way to Farini; Farini's ill-health led to the ministry of Minghetti; Minghetti was succeeded by La Marmora; La Marmora by Ricasoli. All these changes took place within five years of the death of the great statesman who had maintained his position in almost undisputed supremacy for more than twice that period.

The formation of Farini's ministry in the autumn of 1862 had a marked effect on Pasolini's fortunes. Farini is now chiefly known to English readers as the historian whose work has been translated into English by Mr. Gladstone. Years before, in 1848, he had received his first employment in the Papal ministry at Pasolini's suggestion. As Prime Minister he placed his old friend and colleague at the head of the Italian Foreign Office. Mr. Probyn says that Pasolini 'had but little inclination for the official work of a minister.' He certainly availed himself of the opportunity, which Farini's retirement afforded him, of escaping from his duties. But in the few months during which he held the seals of the Foreign Office, he displayed a great, perhaps too great, activity. It was his ambition, to quote his own words, 'to continue the policy of Count Cavour,' and he certainly dealt with every European question from an exclusively Italian standpoint. At the very commence-

ment of his administration he assured Prince Bismarck that, in the event of war between Prussia and Austria, 'there need be no doubt of Italy, for she would always 'side with the enemies of Austria.' The same consideration induced him to maintain the strict alliance between Italy and the two great Western Powers. The same consideration led him in March 1863 to send Count Arese on a special mission to Paris to offer the help of Italy in a war with Austria, for the cause of Poland, and to urge 'the Emperor to decide on some operation to be conducted 'in conjunction with Italy.' The negotiations which in consequence took place will be found detailed in Count Pasolini's pages. Their history seems to us to afford an instructive lesson. The increased power which the events of 1859 and 1860 had given to Italy had removed an old danger, and produced a new one. The chronic revolutions in Lombardy, in the Legations, and in the Two Sicilies, had ceased; but Italy, conscious of her greater weight and disappointed hopes, was ready to convulse a continent in war for any object which might facilitate the conquest of Venetia.

This characteristic of Italian politics was not terminated by the illness of Farini and the retirement of Pasolini. M. Minghetti, who succeeded to the first place in the Italian ministry, pursued the policy of his predecessor. The times seemed ripe for further changes in the map of Europe. Poland was again engaged in a death-struggle for freedom. Russia and Prussia were agreed in putting down the rebellion; and the Western Powers were vainly endeavouring by diplomatic measures to secure terms for the Poles. Napoleon was reviving his favourite idea of a European Congress, and Italy saw to her consternation that there was some possibility of her exclusion from a congress summoned to revise a treaty (that of Vienna) in which she had no part. M. Minghetti consequently decided on sending a special mission to Paris and London, and, in order to give the mission special weight, to entrust it to Pasolini, the ex-Foreign Minister. Pasolini was not only instructed to urge that Italy should take part in any congress which might be held: he was also authorised to promise, if war were decided on, Italian aid. As the price of her assistance, she was to receive Venetia in exchange for the Danubian Principalities, which it was thought the Turks might be induced to concede to Austria.

Pasolini reached London towards the end of July 1863.

He found that neither Lord Palmerston, the Prime Minister, nor Lord Russell, the Foreign Secretary, believed 'in the probability either of the congress or of a war.' Lord Palmerston, indeed, 'had no repugnance to the idea of war,' but he 'thought there should be no war for Venetia unless Italy could carry it through single-handed; "otherwise," said he, "the Emperor, who had already obtained Nice, would be sure "to ask you for something more."' Lord Russell, on the contrary, though 'averse from war, gave his opinion that within 'two or three years some expedient would be found for 'restoring Venice to Italy.' He told a friend that he would not 'object to let Austria herself take Poland, provided she 'would leave Italy wholly free.'

From London, at M. Minghetti's desire, Pasolini went to Paris. He found the Emperor 'affable and very communicative;' 'disgusted with Austria,' but avoiding a quarrel; disinclined to 'meddle with the Roman question;' and 'perhaps not sorry for our difficulty about Venetia, which 'keeps us somewhat dependent upon France.'

'This Emperor, full of uncertainties, will not move or settle anything. He is like a man standing motionless in the dark for fear of knocking his head against a post.'

Yet, before many months were over, Napoleon felt himself forced forward. 'Alienated from England, and fearing lest 'Italy, in her impatience to obtain possession of Venice, 'might attempt some rash enterprise,' he resumed his favourite project for a congress in Paris. The proposal was at once accepted by Italy and Rome. It was rejected by England 'so uncourtously and contemptuously as to induce 'the other powers to decline.' But the English refusal did not at once divert the Emperor from his purpose. He thought that Pasolini should return to London, should 'sound 'Palmerston once more, in order to ascertain, although he 'declines the congress, whether he will enter into the combination' which Italy desired for the liberation of Venetia. Sorely against his will, Pasolini accordingly returned to London in December 1863. At that time a new question, that of Denmark, was disturbing the peace of Europe. The Danish difficulty was drawing the Cabinets of London and Paris a little closer to each other. But, while the Emperor was thinking chiefly of Poland, England was mainly occupied with Denmark; and Italy, though acting with the two great Western Powers, cared for Venice and Venice alone.

"Pasolini's word is general war for general remedy," so said the

English politicians, and it was substantially true. . . . Failing the congress, Italy could do no otherwise than fan the flame of European combustion, and trust that the fortunes of war would put her in possession of her rights.'

A change, however, unfavourable to the Italian cause, had come over the English Cabinet. In the summer Lord Palmerston had seemed not indisposed for action, and Lord Russell averse from war. In the winter Lord Palmerston was 'different . . . from what he was in summer, and touchy ' . . . towards France.'

'He repeated his favourable assurances of the accord between France and England in regard to Venice; adding, however, that, under the actual circumstances of the Danish question, it would be inopportune to trouble Austria by any immediate move.'

Lord Russell, on the contrary, had become more warlike since the summer, and assured Pasolini 'confidentially of 'his willingness to enter into combination with France for 'this negotiation (about Venice).'

The Emperor Napoleon, whom Pasolini again saw on his way home, was even more unsatisfactory. One of his ministers remarked :—

'You will never bring him to any decision, unless it be forced upon him by unexpected events; for he has no settled purpose of his own.'

Thus the two missions on which Pasolini was employed produced few or no results. French and English statesmen, while they were talking to Pasolini about Italy, were really thinking of Poland and Denmark. The Emperor was irritated at the reluctance of English statesmen to intervene actively in Poland. He might perhaps have been tempted to join England in defending Denmark against aggression, but he would probably have exacted a price for his co-operation which English statesmen were hardly prepared to pay. Nothing accordingly was done. In the course of Pasolini's first conversation with Napoleon, indeed, the Emperor casually made a remark which proved his perspicacity :—

'Have I not told you the thing more than once already? Austria and Prussia are now in accordance, but not for long. They soon will have to fight, and then will be Italy's opportunity.'

A little more than two years afterwards the prediction proved true. The Seven Weeks War broke out. True to her policy, Italy threw in her lot with Prussia, and though her army was defeated, after a severe struggle, at Custozza, and

her fleet was beaten by an inferior force off Lissa, the success of the Prussian battalions forced the Austrians to cede Venetia; and Venice 'and the Quadrilateral became integral portions of the Italian kingdom.'

It is a striking proof of the confidence reposed in Pasolini's judgement that Ricasoli, who was then Prime Minister, at once selected him to represent the Crown in the liberated city. 'No one is more worthy than yourself,' he wrote, 'to be the first representative of Italy in beautiful Venice.' The new commissioner entered Venice on October 20, 1866. Late in the following month he accompanied the King in his public entry into the city.

'Lord John Russell was then in Venice, and came to view the pageant from our windows in Palazzo Corner. When my mother saw this old friend appear with the tricolor upon his breast, she said, "Fort bien, milord! nos couleurs italiennes sur votre cœur!" He shook her by the hand and answered, "Pour moi, je les ai toujours portées, Contesse. Je suis bien content de vous trouver ici aujourd'hui. C'est un des plus beaux jours de notre siècle." Somebody then said to Lord Russell what a pity it was that the sun of Italy did not shine more brightly to gild the historical solemnity. "As for that," said he, "England shows her sympathy by sending you her beloved fog from the Thames."

Pasolini resigned his commissionership on the fall of Ricasoli's administration in the following spring, and for the next nine years lived in retirement. In February 1876, M. Minghetti, who was then in office, conferred on him the Presidency of the Senate. 'Your colleagues wish it,' he telegraphed; 'ministers unanimously entreat you. His Majesty rejoices to appoint you. Impossible to refuse.' The King immediately afterwards wrote to him: 'You will do me a personal favour by accepting the presidency of the Senate. The Ministry join in the desire.' Thus urged, Pasolini at once accepted the office. One reason only made him hesitate to do so:—

'He foresaw that some time or other there might be discourses made in Parliament against the aged Pontiff, and that the President might be expected to convey disrespectful sentiments. On this subject he plainly declared, "If anything uncourteous were expressed to Pio Nono, such words should not be spoken by me."

The stipulation was honourably characteristic of the man who had begun life as the Pope's friend and adviser; and it is a pleasure to add that the regard which Pasolini still felt for the Pope was reciprocated by his Holiness. 'Was I not right?' Pio Nono said when he heard of his old

friend's nomination to the office. 'Even Victor Emmanuel, 'when he wants a good man, is obliged to turn to one of 'my old friends.'

We have availed ourselves freely of Lady Dalhousie's volume to illustrate some passages in modern Italian history. Of Count Pasolini himself we have little more to say. Every page of this memoir proves that he was a good, honest, and able man. But many passages in it also prove that he lacked the force and decision which are required in great ministers. If, however, he failed to acquire distinction himself, he was throughout his life the friend of distinguished men; and the publication of his correspondence, as we have shown, frequently throws fresh light on their opinions and on their policy.

In winning freedom and union for Italy many Italians played a great part. History will not easily forget the assistance rendered to her by such men as D'Azeglio with the pen, or by heroes such as Garibaldi with the sword. But, when the story of the regeneration of Italy is finally told, the historian will perhaps concentrate the lights and shadows of his narrative on the characters of two sovereigns and of two statesmen, on Victor Emmanuel and Pio Nono, on Manin and Cavour.

The characters and careers of these four men influenced to a marked extent their country's fortunes. Both Pio Nono and Victor Emmanuel began their long reigns with a fervent ambition to remedy the evils under which Italy was labouring. Both of them were honest, single-minded, and sincerely anxious to do right. On Pio Nono's election to the Papal throne, everything seemed to favour the cause of moderate reform which he endeavoured to promote. The unpopularity of his predecessor's administration, the enthusiasm excited by his own measures, the active support of M. Guizot and M. Rossi, the moral support of Lord John Russell and Lord Minto—all these things were in favour of gradual and hopeful progress. Victor Emmanuel, on the contrary, ascended the throne under circumstances calculated even to make strong men despair. His country's armies had just been decisively defeated; his country's finances were disordered by the cost of an unfortunate war. If the horizon in Rome in 1846 had been bright with the dawn of a better day, the heavens over Piedmont in 1849 had been black with clouds.

Yet, while the bright dawn of 1846 was soon succeeded by storm, the star of Piedmont speedily shone clear from among the clouds of 1849; and the result, in each case, was largely

due to the characters of the two sovereigns. Both of them were in favour of the same measures, but each of them pursued a different course. True to his principles, Victor Emmanuel, from the very first, threw himself on his people, and built his throne anew on the firm foundation of popular support. False to his convictions, frightened at the shadow of his own policy, Pio Nono had not the courage as prince to support the policy which he had accepted as prelate. His fears produced the very evils which had aroused his apprehensions. Forced, after M. Rossi's assassination, to fly from Rome, he saw in his exile the institution of a Roman republic.

But even greater interest attaches to the careers of Manin and Cavour than to those of Victor Emmanuel and Pio Nono. Both men were statesmen of the highest order. Manin, after his remarkable administration and defence of Venice, died in exile. Cavour, after a still more memorable career, died in office, the First Minister of Italy. Manin never lived to see the fruits of his own labours. Cavour enjoyed the success of his own policy, though he was not spared to witness its completion. On Manin's career Pasolini's memoir is almost silent. The story of his life must be sought in other pages. The character of Cavour is more familiar to modern Englishmen. He may be briefly described as both the Peel and the Palmerston of modern Italy. His domestic policy, his bold reforms, his free-trade measures, remind us of the first of these statesmen. In his foreign policy, by the vigour of his conceptions, the tenacity of his purpose, the aptness of his language, and the promptness of his blow, he recalls some of Palmerston's most memorable achievements.

How successful his policy was, Italy to-day is a witness and a proof. We do not forget that in the crises which she has encountered during the present century she has been powerfully aided by her history and her position. Her traditions, her literature, her artists—as well as her valleys, her lakes, and her hills—have won for her the powerful sympathy of the civilised world; while the achievements of engineers, by leading a canal through the desert, and by piercing the St. Gothard and Mont Cenis, have made her, thrust by nature like a pier into the Mediterranean, the main highway between the Eastern and the Western world. But neither the traditions of a mighty past nor the accidents of a fortunate position would have made her the Italy of to-day, if, in the hour of her trial, she had not been true to

herself. 'A great nation,' said Lord Beaconsfield forty years ago, 'is that which produces great men.' Tried by this test, modern Italy may boast that she has graduated in the world's university, and proved herself worthy of the freedom which she has won.

In stating that the experiment of a consolidated Italy has succeeded, we are not merely thinking of the material progress which Italians have made during the last quarter of a century. It is no doubt a noteworthy circumstance that Italy should have already recovered from the sacrifices which she has made; that her budget shows 'an excess of revenue 'over expenditure;' that her paper currency is no longer inconvertible and depreciated; and that her securities command nearly twice the sum on the stock-exchanges of Europe which was asked for them a few years ago. Notwithstanding the poverty which some classes of her population are enduring, and the heavy taxation which a large debt and a high expenditure still require, there are proofs, which it is impossible to ignore, of the growing wealth of the whole nation. The traveller who visits the Peninsula now may find many other symptoms of increasing prosperity. We have, however, less to do with the material progress of modern Italy than with the political success of the new kingdom. The work of liberal politicians in Italy and elsewhere, constitutional government has signally proved conservative in the truest and best sense of the term. Concessions and reforms have terminated the disorders to which Italy was a constant prey, and the *juste milieu* which Prince Metternich thought would inevitably lead to republican measures has proved the best defence against an Italian republic. Order now prevails where disorder once reigned supreme. Brigandage, if not entirely suppressed, is fast disappearing. A people, whose constant revolutions were continually disturbing the peace of Europe, are quiet and contented under constitutional rule; and the youngest of European kingdoms boasts that its throne is one of the firmest in modern Europe.

ART. III.—*Studies Literary and Historical in the Odes of Horace.* By A. W. VERRALL, M.A., Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 8vo. London: 1884.

THERE is much in this ingenious and learned volume of essays which deserves the careful attention even of those whom it fails to convince. New views are not always true views, but nothing is more unjust than to reject or disparage them because from their very novelty they excite in us some feeling of surprise. If the author of this work can show good grounds for his contention that Horace was not merely a composer of graceful lyrics on varied and general topics, but a politician with court interests ever before his eyes, veiled under metaphors from mythology, or pointed at in incidents of social life, it is clear that the literary value and indeed the poetical merits of the 'Odes' must rise very considerably in our estimation. 'Some might think,' he says in his short dedicatory letter to Mr. Wickham, the Master of Wellington College, 'that my views are condemned beforehand, when I postulate that the "Odes" of Horace, as we have them, are substantially the work of the author, all of them genuine, all arranged and divided according to the poet's intention.' That a plan and an object pervade the first three books, which were published together—their publication being declared by 'Exegi monumentum,' &c.—has been made so probable by these essays, that we need not anticipate the adverse verdict of scholars and critics.

It was remarked by Walkenaer, one of the greatest of Horatian critics, that no one could understand the Odes of Horace without a familiar acquaintance with the persons and incidents of the Court of Augustus. They are undoubtedly replete with personal allusions, to which it is not easy to find a key, as the Court of Augustus is not as well known to us as the Court of Louis XIV., and Horace continually uses the types and legends of the Greek mythology to represent the actors in contemporary history. To some of these enigmas Mr. Verrall has sought, not unsuccessfully, to give an explanation and a clue.

Mr. Verrall expresses a doubt whether Horace was in any high sense of the word a poet by nature. 'The fact appears to be,' he says, 'that in general Horace *could* not write poetry;' and he attributes this supposed deficiency to the absence of emotion and earnestness resulting from the *nil admirari* philosophy. He even questions 'whether, but for

'the story of Murena, much of the "Odes" might ever have been written.' He grants that our knowledge of that story, i.e. of the conspiracy, is 'but the barest outline,' and he adds: 'It is reasonable to suppose that if Cæpio's plot and Murena's life were better known to us, we could interpret much that is now without meaning.' But in this matter history has been chary of information, and in the absence of further details its importance has, it is quite possible, been underrated. Thus the Dean of Ely speaks of it as 'the abortive and frivolous conspiracy of Murena,' and dismisses it without further notice. The question is, if Horace really had this event so much in mind, and makes such frequent and subtle allusions to it, were his contemporaries, the *litterati* of the day, aware of it, and did they understand him much better than we do?

No doubt there is a tendency in all enthusiastic advocates of a cause to turn everything into evidence in favour of it. As an instance of this we might, without the least wish to affirm that the view is a wrong one, appeal to Mr. Verrall's contention in the first chapter, headed 'Melpomene,' that the first three books of the 'Odes,' which he holds were published in a collected form in the winter of 20-19 B.C.,* were expressly placed under the patronage of the Tragic Muse in the very last line, because their *general* tone, purport, and moral are tragic or 'dismal.' We may grant that in a medley of poems imbued with the Epicurean spirit of making the best of life there are some—like the beautiful dirge on the death of Quintilius, I. xxiv.—which are mournful, and some which seem to have a note of warning, as I. xiv. and xv., II. iii. and xiv.; but still it is hardly safe to press this invocation of Melpomene as the *tragic* (rather than the lyric) muse so far, just as it seems somewhat exaggerated to style her 'the lady of sorrows.' No doubt Melpomene was regarded in Horace's time as the patroness of tragedy; but this was an evolution from her original character, simply because *lyric* poetry was an essential ingredient of tragedy. In the

* Prof. A. S. Wilkins, in his recently published 'Epistles of Horace,' Introd. p. xv, says: 'The date of the publication of Odes I.-III. does not admit of exact determination. There are arguments which seem to point very strongly to B.C. 24 or 23; there are others which have been considered to point to B.C. 19. But on the whole the evidence for the early year decidedly preponderates.' The importance of the question, 'before or after the year 22,' goes, says Mr. Verrall, 'to the essence of the work.' Whether his arguments for the later date are valid or not, they are certainly very ingenious.

proper sense Melpomene was anything but a *mater dolorosa*; for *μολπή* and *μέλπεσθαι* were primarily applied to joyous dancing-songs (as, for instance, in *Iliad* xviii. 569–572). The circular dances round a central altar, at which, or rather on which, stood the leader with his lute, were the first development of the kind of poetry we call lyric. From its primitive *religious* use it passed into its secondary festive use, because a sacrifice was always inseparable from a feast. Nothing of *pathos* attached to lyrics, except that lyric metres were used for dirges (*θρήνοι*, *neniæ*) in common with elegy. But the ancient elegy was not the ‘*flebilis Elegeia*’ invoked by Ovid in the ‘*Tristia*.’ * Such remains as are attributed to Solon, Tyrtæus, Theognis, are didactic, sententious, patriotic. In the time of Simonides it was more used for epitaphia, while the lyric metres were employed in the musical contests at funerals. Thus there was a tendency in all the words implying *song* to assume a tragic meaning. Even *μολπή* and *ᾠδή* sometimes express dirges in lyric measures; and from these considerations it is easy to understand how and why Melpomene became the goddess of tragedy; she contributed her lyric *ᾠδαί* to vary and enliven the burden of a long drama. We doubt if Mr. Verrall is quite right in criticising the statement of the scholiast on Apollonius, that ‘Melpomene was the inventor of song in general’ (*ᾠδή*). Even the court-bards who recited the *Epos* were called *ᾠδοί*, ‘minstrels;’ and it seems certain that ‘odes’ originally included both joyous and mournful strains. It is not therefore by any means clear that the invocation of Melpomene as ‘*severæ Musa tragœdiæ*’ (*Od.* ii. i. 9) is quite as distinctive as Mr. Verrall holds, seeing that, as he himself quotes, Euterpe, Polyhymnia, Calliope,† Clio, are also summoned to the poet’s aid. ‘Horace,’ says Mr. Verrall, ‘did not misname his muses, or prick for them, like sheriffs, in a list.’ Each of them is named, he thinks, according to the subject they are asked to inspire. If the poet had regarded his books of Odes simply as ‘a miscellany of madrigals, moralities, and national hymns—perfect, let us say, of their kind, but in kind surely anything rather than tragic—could he find,’ he asks, ‘no more decorous name than that of

* The earliest specimen extant of elegy in this sense may be found, if we mistake not, in the fourteen unique verses (about B.C. 420) in the ‘*Andromache*’ of Euripides, 103–116.

† Martial, *Ep.* iv. xxxi., enumerates Melpomene, Polyhymnia, and Calliope, as the muses respectively of elegy, lyrics, and heroics.

'*Melpomene* to subscribe to it?' We might ask, on the other hand, if '*Delphica laurus*' (Od. i. xxx. 15), the chaplet of Apollo, indicative of poetic inspiration and victory over rivals in the art, and for that reason placed on a poet's brow, would have been viewed as the gift of *Melpomene*, and not rather the ivy, which was sacred to *Dionysus* as the god of the drama. However, the relations of these two gods, Apollo and *Dionysus*, and their common cult at Delphi, perhaps justify the occasional interchange of '*laurus*' and '*hedera*' as the poet's wreath.*

Mr. Verrall maintains that the address to this Muse in Od. iv. iii. 1, '*Quem tu, Melpomene, semel Nascentem placido lumine videris,*' &c., is not merely an acknowledgement of success in a lyric composer, or renderer of *Æolian* Greek models, but because '*Horace* thought the dominant note of his three books to be the note of pathos, and the Roman Republic, or at least the aristocratic and cultivated coteries to which the Augustan literature was in the first instance addressed, agreed in this estimate, and were affected accordingly to the poet's intention.' To this view it may be objected that the invocation '*Pieri*' in verse 18 must refer to *Melpomene*; yet to her, and her alone, *Horace* says, he owes the honour of being pointed at as the lyric poet, '*Romanæ fidicen lyræ.*'

It seems to us, then, that the argument from the tragic mask worn by *Melpomene* is rather overstrained, assuming as it does that the closely veiled allusions to *Murena's* conspiracy (if such they really are) were fully understood and rightly interpreted by the courtiers of the day. If they were not so understood, a large portion of these Odes assumes a joyous and even festive character very unsuited to a tragic muse. But Mr. Verrall can only regard *Melpomene* as the goddess of tragedy, and he is concerned to show that, even if she is the goddess of lyric song, 'the lyrics of tragedy, after all, are tragic lyrics, and must serve her main purpose, to awake fear and pity' (p. 1). He goes so far as to say that, but for four poems of a lighter description, the second book 'might be called a dirge.'

It is clear that, if Mr. Verrall's theory is well founded, the '*Odes*' of *Horace* have hitherto been but half understood. For this reason alone his argument claims our attention; for (as he says in p. 7), since the prevalent modern idea of the

* As *Virgil*, Ecl. vii. 25, '*Pastores, hedera crescentem ornate poetam,*' and *Hor.* Od. i. i. 29, '*doctarum hederæ præmia frontium.*'

general tenor of the 'Odes' has taken a somewhat anti-tragical turn, 'it becomes interesting, and promises to be of 'some importance to a right understanding of them, to discover, if possible, the cause of the difference' between the poet's own feeling and the ordinary estimate of the character of these miscellaneous compositions. That cause lies mainly, as he conceives, in the fact that 'his lamentations and his 'musings, as we read them, are always conceived to be 'general and without particular application.' And this remark is certainly quite true.

The key to Mr. Verrall's enquiries on this subject is found in the name 'Murena,' which is prefixed to the first of these essays. Lucius Licinius Murena 'was perhaps the last man 'whom the imperialists would have been disposed to suspect.' For his sister, who seems referred to under the slightly disguised and metrically convenient name 'Licymnia' (i.e. Licinia) in Od. II. xii. 13, was married to Mæcenas, the especial friend and, as we should call him, 'minister' of Augustus, though not precisely in the official sense; and he had himself been treated with great consideration, and perhaps even employed by Augustus. He had been poor, and probably, as a partisan of Antony, had lost his property in the civil wars. Mr. Verrall draws this inference from the connexion of Fontcius Capito with Murena, who entertained at his house the embassy on the journey to Brundisium,* and also with Antony.† In less than ten years afterwards, Murena was living 'in extravagant and dangerous splendour,' and he had even become a member of the dignified collegium of Augurs (Od. III. xix. 10). This fact alone, says Mr. Verrall, proves Murena's wealth; for 'had it been 'possible for a man of moderate means to be an augur, Augustus could not afford to promote him.' Murena, therefore, was in the position to prove a dangerous man, if he had chosen to indulge his spite by plotting against Augustus. For, as Mr. Verrall well observes, 'the one feeling from 'which opposition was to be feared was the restlessness of 'the aristocratic families deprived of the natural prey of 'their ambition, the republican offices and especially the consulship.' Again: 'By the death of Marcellus the prospect 'of the small but wealthy and unscrupulous clique, who 'desired the full restoration of the republican forms, was 'entirely changed. Now, if the emperor could be removed,

* Sat. I. v. 38.

† Ibid. 33, 'Antoni non ut magis alter amicus' (p. 17).

‘the chances were strongly in their favour, and for the next ‘twenty years assassination plots followed each other in ‘rapid succession.’

Mr. Verrall gives excellent reasons for concluding that Murena, who adopted the double cognomen Varro-Murena, had inherited the fortune of the celebrated scholar and antiquary M. Terentius Varro. From him, as in some unknown way connected with the Licinian *gens*, Murena seems to have received ‘the main share of his parks and ‘farms, his marbles, aviaries, rosaries, and scrolls.’ He was, however, accused of conspiring against Augustus, and, in spite of his relationship to Mæcenas, was put to death. Augustus had confided the secret of the conspiracy to Mæcenas; he told it to his wife Terentia, and she conveyed a warning to her brother Murena, who vainly sought safety in flight. Suetonius tells us very little about the matter. In ‘Augustus,’ § 66, he says the emperor wished Mæcenas had been more reticent when he revealed a state-secret to his wife. In § 19 he mentions with equal brevity ‘Varronis-Murenæ et Fanni Cæpionis conjuratio,’ and in § 56 ‘Castricum, per quem de conjuratione Murenæ cognoverat.’ In ‘Tiberius,’ § 8, he refers to the prosecution and conviction for treason conducted by Tiberius: ‘Fannium Cæpionem, qui cum Varrone-Murena in Augustum conspiraverat, reum majestatis apud judices fecit et condemnavit.’ Mr. Verrall shows that Mæcenas never recovered the emperor’s full favour after this event. Most acute is his highly plausible and original explanation of the Ode addressed to Murena (II. x.), ‘Rectius vives, Licini,’ &c., as really (if we understand him aright) intended for a warning to Mæcenas,* out of whose essay entitled ‘Prometheus’ he shows from Seneca that the actual metaphors and even words of the writer were borrowed by the poet. It will seem to most readers a new point of view that the common praise of the poets for the modesty of Mæcenas in remaining only an *eques* was really due to the emperor’s unwillingness to promote him, lest he should turn out a second Murena in his prosperity.

It is very important, says Mr. Verrall, to ascertain the date when the above Ode and that containing a mention ‘auguris Murenæ’ (III. xix. 10) were written; for, of course,

* In p. 45 the words ‘contrahes vento nimium secundo turgida ‘vela’ are interpreted as ‘advice given to Murena when his prosperity ‘is still in the future.’

the publication of the three books about B.C. 20 is a matter of less significance. 'Literary chronology has seldom so 'vital an interest' as it has in the right determination of this question. Thus he shows that 'Murena was a senator' and pushing his way to prominence in the year 22 B.C.'

Mr. Verrall comments at considerable length on the Ode 'Quantum distet ab Inacho' (III. xix.), and concludes from subtle reasonings drawn from the details that the scene described is 'a festive supper* in a house of Murena's at 'or near Reate in the Sabine uplands.' This property Murena had inherited from Varro, whose family seat was at Reate. By 'Pæignis frigoribus' in this Ode the poet means literally the winter cold of this town, which lay close to the Pæignian hills. Mr. Verrall points out the remarkable resemblance, which could hardly be accidental, between 'quo præbente domum' in ver. 7 of the Ode, and 'Murena præbente domum' in Sat. I. v. 38.

Very ingenious, too—we are reluctant to add, if possibly somewhat far-fetched—is the explanation of the obscure words 'quo Chium pretio cadum Mercemur' (ver. 5). This 'buying a jar of wine' at a rich man's entertainment means, he says, the making a complimentary present in return for or in acknowledgement of it. In the present instance he thinks the command in ver. 5, 'da lunæ propere novæ,' ought to be something that could 'be brought as a gift.' He supposes, then—as the 'luna' or ivory crescent was the appendage to the senatorial shoe,† that 'the event celebrated' in this poem is the reception or reassumption by Murena 'of this decoration;' and he considers that we may fairly draw from the poem the inference that 'his admission coincided with the conferring of the augurate.' The words 'da, puer, auguris Murenæ,' i.e. 'cyathum in honorem Murenæ,' certainly show that his health was drunk at the feast. But it is not quite clear that a definite set of questions is being answered *seriatim*. What the poet says is simply this: 'You, Telephus, discuss questions of history, 'but do not utter a word (1) about the price we are to pay 'for our wine, (2) who our (distinguished) host is, (3) at 'what hour we are to dine. Quick, slave! a bumper here ' (1) to the new moon, (2) to midnight, (3) to the good health 'of the augur Murena.' At first sight all this seems to

* When shall we see 'cena' rendered by its only correct equivalent, dinner'? 'Prandium' is the early meal, the French 'déjeuner.'

† 'Appositam nigræ lunam subtextit alutæ.'—Juv. Sat. vii. 192.

mean 'A truce to your learning! Let us talk of social and 'convivial topics.' What is really meant by 'da lunæ pro-
'pere novæ, da noctis mediæ,' must remain somewhat uncertain. All the translators and commentators of Horace have assumed that 'nova luna' means the 'new moon,' which is little better than nonsense, overlooking the fact that the 'luna' is the appropriate decoration of the official rank, just conferred on Murena. Orelli says 'figit esse
'*νοῦμην/αν* nocturnumque simul tempus convivii significat,' the new moon being the first day of the lunar month. Mr. Verrall finds a deeper meaning. 'A title, a decoration, or an appointment (the augurate itself, for example), might be worth the wine even of a great nobleman; and any such gifts of imperial favour Murena's visitors might very well bring him in the shape of an announcement from Rome.' There seems no reason why the 'nova luna,' the new investment with the senatorial shoebadge of an ivory crescent, should not have been actually brought, as an order or a ribbon might now be. In a note, Mr. Verrall adds that perhaps 'nox media' refers to the commencement of the first day of the month or year, and the gift announced may be the 'auguratus' dating from the Kalends.

Whether Horace's contemporaries were likely to interpret aright these references to Murena's political career or not, the suggestion of them, at this late period of historical study, is certainly interesting. Not less so is the new view of the opening words of the Ode 'Quantum distet
'ab Inacho Codrus.' 'The question of the distance in date between Inachus and Codrus was, according to the science of the time, of no small importance. The date of Inachus was the initial era of Greek history. The date of Codrus, last Athenian king, was the initial era of republican Athens.' These and similar topics, Mr. Verrall contends, had been the staple conversation among the *savants* in the villa at Reate during M. Varro's occupancy. The coincidence which he points out between Varro's precept, 'that guests should be not more than the Muses nor fewer than the Graces,' and the words of the Ode 'Qui Musas amat impares,' &c., is certainly too striking to be disregarded.

The Ode 'Rectius vives, Licini' (II. x.), is addressed to Murena after the loss of his property and position through his adherence to Antony's cause. It clearly holds out to him hopes of better times, and it warns him to adopt the 'golden mean,' *auream mediocritatem*, should such times arrive. Horace seems to have been aware that Murena had become

the heir of the wealthy Varro, and possibly he measured his man rightly in regarding him as a vain and thoughtless fool. Mr. Verrall points out that in Ode II. xviii. 17, 'tu secanda marmora Locas,' must be addressed to the 'heres Attali' in ver. 5, and that this really means 'heres Varonis,' the former being king of the literary and book-buying town of Pergamus, the latter the well-known Roman scholar, writer, and antiquary. It is a very shrewd observation, that Varro, in his extant treatise 'De Re Rustica,' in giving a list of previous writers on the same subject, places almost at the head of it 'the very Attalus Philometor of Horace's allusion.' Many minor points, learnedly brought forward and amply illustrated by Mr. Verrall, induce us to think he is right in supposing the entire Ode II. xviii. to refer to Murena. When the poet reminds the spendthrift, 'Novæque pergunt interire lunæ,' he may well be supposed to intimate that even newly made senators may soon fall. It is more difficult to say how the words 'sub ipsum funus' (18) are to be taken. Are they a mere commonplace, 'when you must very soon die,' or was the Ode really written after Murena's execution, B.C. 22, while it supposes him to be still alive, and conveys a warning of the speedy end which such proceedings will bring to an ambitious career?

Horace *may* have felt that the position even of his patron Mæcenas was not exactly safe. He *may* have meant to say, 'Do take warning, my dear friend and patron, from the fate of Murena.' And when he observes (II. xviii. 32), 'æqua tellus Pauperi recluditur Regumque pueris,' we are rather pointedly reminded of 'Mæcenas atavis edite regibus.' Still more, the mention of Tantalus in ver. 37, taken in connexion with III. ii. 25, 'Est et fideli tuta silentio merces,' &c., is singularly appropriate to Mæcenas's betrayal of the state-secret. For the punishment of Tantalus in the underworld was incurred, not merely (as Mr. Verrall says) 'through ill digesting his property,' but because he had 'an undisciplined tongue,' and divulged to man the divine mysteries.

There must be some connexion between II. xviii. 20, III. i. 33, and III. xxiv. 3, in all which places the building of piers or moles projecting into the sea is plainly described. Murena is blamed for doing this as well as for evicting poor tenants and pulling up the boundary-stones of his clients. It happens that an exact explanation of the 'jactæ in altum moles' is found in a fresco-painting representing either Baïæ or

Puteoli.* Here the villas are drawn standing on jagged volcanic rocks at the very edge of the sea, and several of them have jetties built on piles and arches projecting a considerable way into it. The parade of great wealth was a dangerous thing in Imperial Rome. Commenting on the passage in III. xxiv. 7, Mr. Verrall supposes the words ‘non ‘mortis laqueis expedies caput’ to refer to the usual instrument of execution, and it is quite conceivable that the poet may have had in view Catiline’s end.

Following out his clue to the interpretation of subtle meanings in the fortunes of Murena, Mr. Verrall proceeds to observe that ‘in various parts of the poems on public ‘history and politics the myths relating to the defeat and ‘punishment of rebels against the gods—the giants, Prometheus, Tantalus, &c.—are used to typify the contemporary ‘struggle of order against anarchy, Jupiter typifying the ‘emperor and the cause of Rome, his enemies the contrary ‘forces over which they prevailed.’ He shows that ‘there ‘is an unmistakeable point in the prominence given to ‘Apollo’ (III. iv. 60–4), since Suetonius (Aug. 94) speaks of Augustus as ‘Apollinis filium existimatum,’ from a dream which his mother Atia was said to have had. In p. 79 it is shown that the ‘Divus’ invoked in iv. vi. 1 is not so much Apollo himself ‘as Augustus or his representative Tiberius,’ ‘the princely avenger of Rome upon the Alpine barbarians.’ In Ode III. iv., he observes, ‘the battle of the Titans fills a ‘large space.’ The poet there says that the furious attack of the rebel giants could do nothing against the celestial powers ranged against them—Pallas, Juno, Vulcan, and Apollo. Mr. Verrall contends that ‘the celestial group ‘selected, in its relation to the monarch—daughter, wife, ‘and two sons—answers precisely to the imperial family, ‘as it stood in the year 22, and then only—Augustus, Julia, ‘Livia, Tiberius, and Drusus.’ He goes even further than this in his theory of occult meanings, and explains ‘Vos ‘(Camenæ) Cæsarem altum, militia simul Fessas cohortes ‘abdidit oppidis,’ &c. (III. iv. 37), of the illness of Augustus in Spain, B.C. 25, during the Cantabrian war, the founding of the colonies for veterans (Augusta Prætorianorum and Augusta Emerita), and the retirement of the emperor from further military duties—‘finire quærentem labores.’

In the appeal to the Muses, and the ‘Pierio recreatis

* Engraved in Plate 49 of ‘*Raccolta de’ più belli Dipinti*,’ &c., Naples, 1854.

‘antro,’ the name of the emperor’s successful physician, Antonius Musa, is implied; for ‘the Muses were the patrons of the healing art, as of all the arts, and especially favourable, it might be supposed, to their namesake—if indeed his remarkable name was not rather due to his ‘skill’ (p. 59). ‘Pierio antro’ is referred to the abode of the Thessalian Chiron, the teacher of Æsculapius; and ‘Vos lene consilium et datis et dato Gaudetis’ (ver. 41) is the soothing counsel of the physician. Most of the eminent physicians practising at Rome under the Empire were Greeks, as many known names indicate—Alcon, Archigenes, Craterus, Philippus, Heras, Themison, Charicles, Glyco, Symmachus, Hermocrates; and it is likely enough that this man, who had also the care of the young Marcellus when he died at Baiæ, was of the same nation, but had adopted a form of name more suited to Roman ears. Mr. Verrall, who has so keen a scent for ‘allusions,’ regards the words ‘seu mihi frigidum Præneste seu Tibur supinum Seu liquidæ placuere Baiæ’ (ver. 22), as referring to Musa’s practice in sending his patients from warm and enervating to colder and more bracing resorts.

It is not difficult to believe that the conquest of the Titans by Jupiter alludes to the suppression of Murena’s conspiracy by Augustus; but that ‘Cælo tonantem credidimus Jovem Regnare,’ in Od. III. v. 1, has a connexion, ‘in a manner not to be mistaken,’ with the dedication by Augustus of the temple of Jupiter Tonans as a votive offering for his narrow escape from a thunderstorm in Spain, and with the words in III. iv. 44, ‘fulmine sustulerit caduco,’ is more doubtful, since both may be mere poetic commonplaces. Still, Mr. Verrall has always one strong point in his favour: he does not merely guess, but he illustrates and supports his points by a wealth of learning which reminds one of Bentley’s method. He might indeed have pressed into his service the words of Propertius (III. x. 47) to Mæcenas—

‘*Te duce vel Jovis arma canam, cæloque minantem
Cœcum et Phlegæis Oromedonta jugis*’—

as a theme suggested to the poet either directly by the minister or by a perusal of his book entitled ‘Prometheus.’

The silence of Horace respecting the death of the young Marcellus, an event celebrated in a beautiful passage by Virgil (*Æn.* vi. 884) and a not less beautiful elegy by Propertius (III. xviii.), gives rise to some ingenious speculations in a note on p. 60. Marcellus died in the autumn of B.C. 23,

and the single allusion to him, 'Crescit occulto velut arbor ævo Fama Marcelli' (Od. I. xii. 45), if this Marcellus, the young son of Octavia, is really meant—which Mr. Verrall does not believe—must, of course, have been written some time before the publication of the 'Odes' in B.C. 20, supposing that 'fama' is not posthumous fame, but the celebrity of the living man. It seems strange that a court poet should not have a word to say about the demise of the young Marcellus. But Mr. Verrall thinks that Horace, unlike Virgil, was but half-hearted in his friendship for Augustus, and did not really sympathise with his dynasty after having fought on the other side at Philippi. Indeed, the excuses given in Epist. I. i. to the invitation of Mæcenas that he should resume lyric composition, look like reluctance; for, as Professor A. Wilkins observes, it was 'natural for Mæcenas to wish that his friend and *protégé* should not lose the opportunity (of the eastern expedition, B.C. 21) for a panegyric on the emperor and his policy.' It seems indeed significant that the conspiracy of Murena followed within a few months after the death of the heir. There is reason therefore to suspect that the poet's warnings to Murena, and possibly to others who secretly sympathised with his tyrannicidal views, were really friendly; '*sapienter idem* 'Contraheas vento nimium secundo Turgida vela' (II. x. 22). These words seem written in no other spirit than II. xviii., viz. to show the dangers incurred by a too great display of wealth and influence.

This indeed seems the key to the much-praised 'contentment' of Mæcenas, on whom Mr. Verrall proceeds to make some interesting remarks. Augustus, we may conceive, feared to raise Mæcenas, for a time at least, to any high position in the State, for no one could tell who might be an accomplice in the next conspiracy. But Mæcenas on his own part boasted to his friends that he had no wish to rise higher than the rank of an *eques*. Propertius (III. ix.), in a rather long address to this patron of poets, commences thus:—

'Mæcenas, eques Etrusco de sanguine regum,
Intra fortunam qui cupis esse tuam;'

and he goes on to say that though he might have held civil or military honours, he declined all such political favours at the hands of Augustus:—

'Parcis, et in tenues humilem te contrahis umbras;
Velorum plenos contrahis ipse sinus' (ver. 29).

Of course it was politic on his own part to call this retire-

ment a favour and a permission rather than a choice. Seneca, whom Juvenal calls 'prædives,' when his enemies were whispering to Nero * that his wealth and popularity were becoming dangerous,† pleaded the example of Augustus in allowing Mæcenas, while he lived in the city, the same leisure and retirement as if he had been abroad.‡ The popularity gained by patronising literature, and the harmless boast that he had Etruscan, if royal, ancestry, 'atavis regibus editus,' were not likely to excite any suspicion of political intriguing. Those who could claim to be of the old Roman and Troy-descended stock were likely to have an influence with the *populus* in restoring the republic far beyond that of alien-born citizens, however wealthy. It may therefore have suited Mæcenas's purpose to boast of an Etruscan origin.§ In Nero's time vain persons, it may be from the example of Mæcenas, pretended (Persius, iii. 28) to pride themselves on their Etruscan descent:—

'An deceat pulmonem rumpere ventis,
Stemmata quod Tusco ramum milesime ducis?'

The marriage of Mæcenas to a sister of Murena, already alluded to, greatly increased the danger of his position, unless an ostentatious moderation—the very opposite policy to Murena's—had been adopted as a safeguard and for the express purpose of diverting suspicion. Mr. Verrall thinks it clear that Mæcenas did not enjoy the full confidence of his imperial master. Their 'inner relations were gravely 'disturbed, and his position as counsellor damaged so that 'it was never entirely restored.' Mæcenas, however, always professed, and possibly quite sincerely, loyalty to the imperial house. Hence Propertius says (III. ix. 34):—

'Mæcenatis crunt vera tropæa fides.'

Conceding that Mr. Verrall is probably right in holding this view of the real relation between the emperor and the

* Tacitus, Ann. xiv. 52.

† 'Tanquam ingentes et privatum modum evectas opes adhuc auget, quodque studia civium in se verteret,' &c.

‡ 'C. Mæcenati urbe in ipsa velut peregrinum otium permisit.' Ibid. 53.

§ 'Tyrrhena regum progenies,' Od. III. xxix. 1. The name 'Mæcenas' has something of an Etruscan ring, like 'Porsenna,' 'Perpenna,' 'Ergenna.' 'Murena,' perhaps, may be a 'totemistic' name, after the fish so called. Other names derived from legumes, as 'Cicero,' 'Piso,' 'Fabius,' 'Cæpio,' or from animals, as *Lupus*, *Mus*, *Corvinus*, *Taurus*, *Asella*, possibly had a like origin in a remote totemism.

minister, we have still to ask ourselves whether the explanation offered of 'Telegoni juga parricidæ' (iii. xxix. 8) is not overstrained. Murena's newly inherited villa, says Mr. Verrall, was at Tusculum; and as 'parricidium' bears the legal and political sense of 'murder with treason,' Mæcenas is told not to be always looking in a direction which must be suggestive of unpleasant memories, that is, of the accusation of Murena. Again, is the passage in Od. III. ii. 25, 'Est et fidei tuta silentio Merces: vetabo, qui Cereris sacrum' 'Vulgarit arcanæ,' &c.—is this really an allusion to the *confarreatio* in the marriage of Mæcenas to Terentia, and to his having divulged to her the secret of Murena's plot? 'The suggestion is most ingenious; yet, as the 'Mysteries,' to reveal the secrets of which was, like the sin of Tantalus, the gravest of crimes, were celebrated in connexion with Ceres as an elemental goddess, we can well account for 'sacrum Cereris' without having recourse to 'confarreatio.'

Considering the very small part which the conspiracy of Murena plays in history, it may seem strange that so complete a series of allusions to it should, according to Mr. Verrall's theory, be traceable in the Odes. Again, there is this anomaly, that poems published, if not written, after the execution of Murena, should take the form of warnings lest that should happen which actually did happen. 'The poems on Murena,' he says, 'are, so to speak, antedated; they are pictures of the past coloured to suit the known sequel.' This view, he thinks, is 'the character of the "Odes" in general, so far as they relate to real events; and it is the key to many of their difficulties.' The one point and object—the 'function' of the second book, is 'to bring upon the stage with suitable accompaniments the figure of Murena.' Certainly, when we reflect how seriously Murena's brother-in-law Mæcenas was compromised by that conspiracy, how gratefully the poet always speaks of him as his patron, 'præsidium et dulce decus meum,' and from first to last the theme of his verse, 'prima dicte mihi, summa dicende Camena' (Epist. I. i), we are bound to admit that the praises of the ruler, or rather the attribution of power to him in punishing rebellion, must have been so framed as to give no offence to the minister, and may well have been so framed as to constitute a warning to the *eques*. In bringing out this view in a clear convincing manner, Mr. Verrall has rendered a good service to the study of Roman literature.

The fourth essay, entitled 'Lamia,' contains a very in-

genious argument to show that in ‘Æli vetusto nobilis ab Lamo’ (Od. III. xvii.), and ‘Me quamvis Lamia pietas et cura moratur’ (Epist. I. xiv. 6), the same person is meant, and that person not a noble at all, but a slave in the writer’s own *familia*. ‘Lamia’ was the cognomen, as it happened, of a Roman house, one member of which, at least, became distinguished, though some years after Horace’s death, a L. Ælius Lamia having held the consulship and later still (A.D. 32) the *præfectura* of the city. ‘There is evidence,’ says Mr. Verrall, ‘that these Ælii were of good position in ‘the last days of the republic.’ Hence Lamia the slave is bantered for his noble descent from Lamus, the cannibal monster of the ‘Odyssey.’* The form of the name, it might have been remarked, is peculiarly servile, like Sosia and Glaucia for Sosias, Glaucias. Now Mr. Verrall calls attention to the grandiose beginning and the ridiculous ending of the Ode: ‘Great descendant from the Lamos of olden time, king and founder of cities! I see rain is coming; get in wood while it is dry, and to-morrow you shall be rewarded with—‘a holiday and a good dinner!’ The joke is really not a bad one; and Mr. Verrall might have strengthened his argument by noticing the irony in ‘nobilis.’ This word did not signify, properly at least, ‘of noble descent,’ but was applied to those plebeians who could boast of an ancestor ‘ennobled’ by a curule office. The common explanation of the Ode, that it contains an invitation to a real Ælius Lamia to dine, makes the warning about stacking the faggots—‘dum potis, aridum Compone lignum’—quite nonsensical. We confess ourselves persuaded that Mr. Verrall is right, and we believe he is not less so in concluding that the *vilicus*, the farm-bailiff addressed in the Epistle, was this very Lamia who happened at the time to have lost a brother. When therefore the poet says (v. 6)—

‘Me quamvis Lamia pietas et cura moratur
Fratrem mærentis,’

Mr. Verrall submits that there is but one way of giving the passage a connected sense, and that is to take ‘Lamia pietas’ as an equivalent for ‘pietas tua.’ It is a good remark, that the change of person is illustrated in this very Epistle by ‘melior sit Horatius’ for ‘ego,’ v. 5. Professor Wilkins rightly points out in his note that ‘Lamia pietas et

* x. 81. The name, meaning ‘gaper,’ ‘wide-mouthed,’ or ‘goblin,’ contains the same root as ‘Lemures,’ and perhaps as ‘lama,’ pronounced ‘lamma,’ a wide ditch or dyke, Epist. I. xiii. 10.

'cura' cannot mean, as some have taken it, 'my love for 'Lamia.' He thinks, however, that the 'brother' whose loss is here mentioned, was Q. Ælius Lamia, younger brother of Lucius, to whom the Ode is addressed. If we follow the thread of the argument (1-10), the poet seems to say, 'My fondness for the country which you, the resident bailiff, call dull, is so great that I should pay a visit to my farm at once were I not kept back by your recent family loss, which you take so much to heart that it would be impossible for you at present to give the proper attention to me or my business.' This is at once kind and reasonable, and the correlation of 'quamvis' with 'tamen' is intelligible. If some other 'Lamia' is meant (Od. i. xxvi. 7 and xxxvi. 7), the poet must mean that he is detained in the city by his attendance on his afflicted friend. But 'Lamiæ pietas et cura' thus assumes a double meaning, viz. Lamia's affection for his brother, and the poet's regard ('cura') for Lamia, i.e. a meaning both subjective and objective.

Not less ingenious, if less convincing, are the remarks on the 'Lamia' of i. xxxvi. 7, where the name is regarded as fictitious. That 'Numida' contains an allusion to 'Nomas,' 'Wanderer,' and 'Bassus' to a deep drinker (*βαθύς*), is not strikingly probable. Yet Martial, it might have been noticed (Ep. vi. lxix. 2), mentions one 'Bassus' as a notorious drinker:—

'Miror quod Bassi filia potat aquam.'

We must say that Essay V., inscribed, from the words in Od. ii. iii. 18, 'Quam Tiberis lavit,' appears to us on the whole less satisfactory as an argument based on purely inferential meanings. We have read it with care, but fail to be convinced that the comparison of human affairs to a flood, 'cetera fluminis ritu feruntur,' &c.—in iii. xxix. 33, which is one of the Odes addressed to Mæcenas—conveys any warning of a political catastrophe, or that the mention of the fine house and gardens of Dellius on the bank of the Tiber indicates that the owner may some time be swept away by a like convulsion. It is quite true that, as in the case of Murena and the demolition of the palatial house of M. Manlius Capitolinus, the pride, the power, the popular influence, and the ulterior designs of great house-builders often excited the jealousy of the ruling powers, both of the Republic and the Empire, like the wealth and magnificence of the feudal barons in the time of the Plantagenets. But if the Romans were so excessively superstitious as really to

believe that 'the outbreak of the indignant Tiber upon 'Rome presaged the death of Marcellus,' would they have enquired 'what death did the ravages' (of the river Liris, ambiguously alluded to in I. xxxi. 7 and III. xvii. 8) 'upon 'Formiæ and Marica presage?' The sudden death of an heir to the throne might be preceded by 'portents;' but would the fall of an ambitious citizen be so supernaturally signalised? There was a connexion, Mr. Verrall reminds us, and one which he thinks would naturally suggest itself to a Roman reader, 'between the region of the Liris and the 'family of Murena. For there, at Formiæ, lay his house, 'the house which he lent to Mæcenas, Capito, and the other 'ambassadors with whom Horace journeyed to Brundisium.' In two other passages (Od. I. xx. 11 and III. xvi. 34) Horace 'contrasts his own modest fortunes with the wealth of 'Formiæ.' What he does say, however, amounts to nothing more than this, that he cannot afford to give his friends the choicer kinds of wine, of which the Formian was one.

We think, too, that the familiar epithet '*flavus* Tiberis,' 'yellow Tiber,' need not be pressed beyond its obvious meaning in I. ii. 13. Everyone who has seen the Tiber in flood must recognise the truth of the epithet. But Mr. Verrall contends that these words in II. iii. 18 mean a great deal more. 'The golden water is beautiful enough in this 'summer weather; the pine and the poplar, as they embrace 'over the streamlet which hurries to mix with it, seem a 'very picture of friendliness and peace. But why is the 'river golden? Because the banks are of weak sand, and 'the river is silently "washing" them away.' It is not clear whether Mr. Verrall takes '*lympha fugax*' to mean the water of the Tiber or that of some streamlet that ran through the garden into the river. We cannot say that his theory of '*quid obliquo laborat Lympha fugax trepidare 'rivo?*' being a *parenthesis* is at all satisfactory. To us it appears to show a want of poetic taste and feeling. If only we might read '*ubi*' for '*quid*,' all would be simple; a 'rapid' in the river, running (as rapids generally do when the water of a stream is low) *aslant* across the channel, and shaded by trees which seem to shake hands from the opposite banks, is described as a pleasant spot to recline upon and enjoy life in while the Fates allow. But, parenthesis or not, the Latinity is very perplexing. The interrogatory reading adopted by Mr. Munro appears to us to be unintelligible. Bentley read '*qua pinus ingens*,' &c., which makes sense of the whole passage.

The Excursus on Essay V. may be cited as an example of Mr. Verrall's way of finding some hidden meaning under ordinary expressions—of 'over-explaining' the Odes, we might say. Horace, in the pretty little Ode, i. xx., invites Mæcenas to taste some plain country wine bottled by himself on his Sabine farm, which farm had been presented to him by Mæcenas. He adds that he is sorry he can offer nothing more choice; 'the Cæcuban and Calenian wines you can get from your own cellar; I have no such brands as Falernian or Formian.' Nothing can be simpler, and it is only raising a difficulty where there is absolutely none to say (p. 146): 'Considering that Horace is inviting Mæcenas to the retreat which he enjoyed by Mæcenas's liberality, is there not a singular want of taste in this emphatic contrast between the entertainment he could offer and such as the minister could enjoy at home?' Want of taste! Should we think a friend showed this if he wrote, 'Come and lunch to-morrow; you shall have a glass of tidy sherry, if not quite as fine as your own Amontillado'? But some editors seem to have quarrelled with 'tu bibes uvam' in verse 10. Mr. Munro proposed 'tu vides,' 'you provide;' and Mr. Verrall, who gives us a learned disquisition on Mæcenas's poor health and forced abstention from certain kinds of wine, which were supposed to cause feverishness, improves on the above by suggesting 'invidet uvam,' 'you look at it askance, enviously, with an evil eye.'

For ourselves we reject both of these conjectures without the slightest hesitation. The late Mr. Munro's authority as a critical scholar fails to convince us that 'videre uvam' can mean anything but 'to see a grape' or a bunch of grapes; and 'invidere uvam,' if we say nothing of the loss of the important antithesis in 'tu' and 'mea,' is only correct in the sense of 'grudging something to another,' as in Virgil's well-known verse (Ecl. vii. 58):—

'Liber pampineas invidit collibus umbras.'

Again, nothing can be simpler or more obvious than the phrase 'uvam prelo domitam,' a mere poetical variety of 'pressam.' But no! Mr. Verrall will have it that 'the picturesque epithet "domitam" indicates that the growths mentioned by Horace were among the strongest and most spirituous in the Roman list.' It seems to us that subduing the strength of wine by age is quite a different matter.

We are not specially interested in Essay VI., 'Venus and Myrtale,' nor does it much signify whether Horace was a

downright libertine or took up with the lax morality of the age in the matter of 'mistresses' with somewhat less ardour than his contemporaries Catullus, Propertius, and Tibullus. For our own parts we do not think Horace's character in this matter is very easily 'whitewashed.' Mr. Verrall, observing that 'the moral tone of the Three Books (of the Odes) is 'very high,' in the 'private' poems no less than in the 'public,' inclines to believe that the poet 'respected and 'wrote for Augustus because Augustus strove to be a moral 'reformer,' rather than that 'when he professes an interest 'in moral reform it is because he was bound to please 'Augustus.' Mr. Verrall doubts if Augustus would have employed Horace, knowing him to be a hypocrite in his praises of morality, to write the '*Carmen Seculare*,' 'in 'which the boys and maidens of the nation, by the lips of 'their highest representatives, implored the gods of purity 'to bless the reforming work of the imperial Apollo.' We do not think the argument very cogent. Augustus himself, who enforced the existing law '*de pudicitia*,' was not a moral man, at least in his earlier life.* The laws about chastity and marriage, '*de maritandis ordinibus*,' were a political resource for restoring the number of citizens diminished by the civil war, and had nothing to do with the personal virtue of the legislator.

Essay VII. and last is inscribed '*Euterpe*.' It is a disquisition on metrical matters of a technical character, and therefore not particularly interesting to the many. Nevertheless, as conjectural criticism, unless directed by the soundest poetical taste and feeling, is apt to go widely astray, we think it right briefly to discuss some new readings put forward in this chapter. For we agree that 'to the 'full appreciation of Augustan poetry some interest in the 'subject is indispensable.' Mr. Verrall holds the opinion—in spite of some examples, which he endeavours to explain away, of an open vowel between the end of one verse and the beginning of the next—that Horace hardly ever permitted himself this license. He might have noticed that in the single Ode i. vii. there are no less than three examples of non-elision, vv. 8, 25, 28 (not to add 29, since it ends with a full stop). Still, beyond question, it is generally true that the continuity of the verses, in respect of elision, is very faithfully observed. Mr. Verrall puts forth this fact rather strongly:

* '*Prima juventa variorum dedecorum infamiam subiit.*'—Suetonius, Aug. 68.

'The precision of Horace, when the occasion justifies the 'severest form, is something almost miraculous.' Thus he allows 'ponto | unda recumbit,' 'Thrace | otium,' 'imago | 'aut,' on the ground either of the strong vowels or of an intervening stop; but he dislikes or distrusts 'caducum | in 'domini caput,' 'apricum | oderit campum,' 'leonum | arida 'nutrix,' and even condemns as untenable 'fugerit invida | 'ætas' (I. xi. 7), and 'fias recantatis amica | opprobriis.' He goes so far as to assert dogmatically (we do not in the least agree with him) in p. 190 that 'the letters "invida ætas" must stand for the sound "invid' ætas;" such a 'pronunciation as "invidä ætas" is impossible to the lyric 'Muse.'

What then is to be done? Why, recourse must be had to emendation. Now emendation, to convince and to be accepted by the majority of reasonable people, requires more than mere ingenuity or than a knowledge of the changes and corruptions of words and letters acquired by the science of palæography. It is a special faculty based on an instinctive perception of absolute fitness—such a perception as becomes in a manner intuitive from long study and the practice of composition after the best models. Of course, there may be cleverness and originality in a critic, but at the same time a want of poetical judgement in dealing with the texts of the ancient poets. In this last respect Mr. Verrall seems to us to excel less than in the other qualities.

Commencing with the correction of a pentameter in Catullus, where the late Prof. Munro advocated the not very euphonic reading 'Quare cur te iam a! amplius 'excrucies?' (the context shows 'cur te iam tam pius' is the true one), Mr. Verrall contends that 'if the last syllables 'of "invida" and "amica" (above) be lengthened into sighs ' (which is the effect in sound of writing "invida a!" and ' "amica a!"') the metre is saved.'

In this we think there is a want of poetic taste. Poetry is sacrificed to an arbitrary metrical canon based on ordinary but by no means invariable usage. A similar offence against manifest propriety in the order of words is the change introduced into the text of the 'Agamemnon'* by a recent editor,

* 1070, Prof. Kennedy, who reads ταλαίναϊς "Ἴτυν | φρεσὶν" Ἴτυν for ταλαίναϊς φρεσὶν Ἴτυν. Ἴτυν στένουσα. It is impossible here to separate either ταλαίναϊς φρεσὶν or the two words supposed to be the name of a lost child. Euripides (frag. Phaeth. 775, 24, Nauck) has Ἴτυν Ἴτυν πολύθρηνον, and ἄ Ἴτυν αἰὲν Ἴτυν ὀλοφύρεται, in Soph. El. 148, carries a special emphasis on the name, 'Itys, nothing but Itys.'

who, to secure a long syllable at the end of the preceding verse, separated two words intended to express the mournful note of the nightingale.

Not more happy is Mr. Verrall's suggestion (p. 191, note 3) to read in I. ii. 47 'Neve te nostris vitiis iniquum o! ocior' *'aura Tollat.'* With all his boldness in conjectural alteration, Bentley, we think, would not have ventured on this. Surely an easier remedy, if need be, might be found in reading 'fortior' for 'ocior,' as we speak of a *strong* wind. Martial uses this expression (Ep. viii. xiv. 2): '*Mordeat et tenerum' fortior aura nemus.*'

That *o* is often left open before another *o* is so certain that Mr. Verrall need not have gone out of his way in supposing 'i secundo | omine' (III. xi. 50) requires to be defended by a far-fetched theory of 'letting the voice falter' where euphony prescribes.' Such 'collisions,' especially with the *ictus*, as 'Naupactöo Achelöo,' 'letifero Eveno' (Ovid), show clearly the perfect legitimacy of the unelided *o* equivalent to the Greek omega.

Some want of poetic taste, we fear, in this very stanza is the suggestion that 'I pedes quo te rapiunt et auræ'—a truly charming verse—'go wherever your feet hurry you away,' means 'go where the sheets (of the sail) carry you.' Is there any example of 'pes' used in this sense in the plural? No argument can be founded from 'et auræ.' The Greeks familiarly say 'with the breeze' (*κατ' οὖρον*) for a rapid and successful flight—i.e. down, or according to, the current of the wind.

Mr. Verrall proceeds to say (p. 193): 'The case is scarcely 'less strong against the non-elision (except at strong stops) 'of the syllable *-um*. It is elided constantly, and at the 'end of the line as well as elsewhere. To neglect the elision 'for mere convenience is therefore a gross offence against 'euphony.' We should have preferred to say 'To admit the 'non-elision as a rare license is perhaps to be regarded as 'an archaism.' For it seems certain that Plautus sometimes allowed it even in the middle of a verse, the *-us* and *-um* in old Latin representing *-os* and *-ov* in Greek. We have two examples of this in the prologue to the 'Rudens' (vv. 10 and 22), 'Is nos per gentes alium alia dispartat,' 'Atque hoc scelesti in animum inducunt suum.' In the former verse the Greek formula (*ἄλλον ἄλλῃ*) was in the poet's view; in the latter, either the *i* in 'scelesti' or the *um* in 'animum' is an open syllable. The 'Argument,'

perhaps indeed not genuine, of the 'Trinummus' begins thus:—

'Thensaurum abstrusum abiens peregre Charmides.'

'Miles Gloriosus,' I. i. 4:—

'Præstringat oculorum aciem in acie hostibus,'

where again either *em* or *e* is unelided. Nothing but very deteriorated rhythm is gained by Fleckheisen's attempted restorations. In the same way we think to retain an exceptional use in Horace better and safer than to make a tasteless change.

Mr. Verrall should not, in our opinion, have interfered with 'cur apricum oderit campum' in I. viii. 3. 'Say, Lydia, why Sybaris now hates the exercises in the sunny Campus Martius, well able as he is to stand both the heat and the dust.' A comparison of Sat. I. viii. 15, 'aggere in aprico spatium,' and Ep. ad Pisones 162, 'aprici gramine campi,' establishes the meaning and, as we believe, the correctness of this reading 'apricum' beyond the shadow of a doubt. But Mr. Verrall, on the other hand, in the last page of his work, 'goes off' with an emendation for which he had prepared the way in a note on p. 143. He there says, what is perfectly true, that 'the fundamental sense (of "apricus") is not warm but clear, and in this sense Propertius has even *aprico frigore*.' The root of the word, as in 'Aprilis,' seems the same as in 'aperire.' The 'aprici senes' of Persius (v. 179) are the old men who sit at their doors enjoying the sunshine; and 'aprici flores' (Od. I. xxvi. 7) are not 'summer flowers,' but simply the flowers which, as every observer knows, come out so fully and in such bright colours to the sunlight. We think Mr. Verrall entirely mistaken in supposing the notion of 'delicate,' 'chilly' ('frileux,' 'shivery'), ever attaches to the word. No two ideas, we should say, have less connexion with each other. We feel therefore bound to protest against the reading now proposed:—

'cur *apricus*

Oderit campum, patiens pulveris atque solis:'

'Why has Sybaris, who (in summer) could stand any extreme of heat, now (in winter) turned delicate, shrinking from the cold of the *campus* and the river?' This strikingly novel interpretation is put forward with some confidence. 'I have myself not much doubt,' says the author, 'that the true reading is *apricus*.'

We have devoted considerable space to this last essay,

‘Euterpe,’ because the issues of the criticisms offered on the text of Horace are rather serious, and because we greatly doubt if Mr. Verrall’s province is to emend so much as to interpret. He is learned in history and very accurate in scholarship; but possibly this very accuracy leads him to doubt received readings without sufficient cause, and to alter them without that careful consideration which is ready to make allowance, under due limits, for some anomalies and some eccentricities in a poet.

Taken as a whole, Mr. Verrall’s ‘Studies in Horace’ contains much matter in advance of even the latest editions of this charming poet; and it may be expected that future editors will acknowledge their obligations to him. They will have to weigh the evidence, for instance, adduced in pp. 77–82, to show that ‘Achilles’ mentioned in III. xix. and IV. vi. is really Murena in mythological disguise; and generally, they will have to determine whether an under-current of thought, deep but strong, carries along the whole body of song in the ‘Odes.’ It is perhaps well that, having no exaggerated admiration for the Horatian stanza, the author’s mind has been turned rather to the matter than the manner of the ‘Odes.’ ‘The style,’ he says, ‘is remarkable ‘rather for the grace, terseness, and point, which have made ‘the poet an unfailing source of quotation, than for the strength or the subtlety of the feelings expressed.’ Perhaps this is true, for Horace was above all things the poet of common sense; the studied harmony of the lyric verse is, however, captivating to the most ordinary ear, while the exquisite Latinity—which, indeed, is equally conspicuous in the earlier poets, Plautus, Lucretius, Catullus—will always excite the admiration of accomplished scholars. It is henceforth for the historian to claim a still larger share in the literary feast.

- ART. IV.—1. *France and England in North America. A Series of Historical Narratives.* By FRANCIS PARKMAN, Boston. Part I.: 'The Pioneers of France in the New World.' Fifteenth Edition, 1879. Part II.: 'The Jesuits in 'North America.' Twelfth Edition, 1878. Part III.: 'La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West.' Eleventh Edition, 1879. Part IV.: 'The Old Régime in Canada.' Thirteenth Edition, 1884. Part V.: 'Count Frontenac and New France under Louis XIV.' Twelfth Edition, 1884.
2. *Montcalm and Wolfe.* By FRANCIS PARKMAN. Two vols. London: 1884.
3. *History of the City of New York: Its Origin, Rise, and Progress.* By MRS. MARTHA C. LAMB. Two vols. 4to. Illustrated. New York and Chicago: 1877.

IN geographical science the fourteenth century had progressed but little beyond the knowledge of Ptolemy. It was still disputed whether the shape of the world was round or square, or, as the most orthodox asserted, a tabernacle. In map-making, mediæval geographers had retrograded. They fell back on the Homeric disk surrounded by ocean. The centre of the earth was the turreted city of Jerusalem; in the extreme east lay Paradise fenced in with flames; the 'Mare Magnum,' flowing like a T north and south and west, divided Europe, Asia, and Africa. Fifty years later, the bounds of the known world were the coasts of Norway in the north, Atlas in the south, the pillars of Hercules to the west, to the east the Holy Sepulchre. Beyond these limits to the south and east lay the semi-fabulous regions of Prester John, Cipango, and Cathay. Except by the Norsemen the 'Oceanus dissociabilis' was still unexplored, when Henry the Navigator inaugurated the new era of maritime discovery. From that time forward commerce changed its direction and its character. Traffic was transferred from the land to the ocean, from the Mediterranean to the Atlantic, from the Italians to the Western States of Europe. No sooner had Columbus and Cabot discovered the New World than Western Europe competed for its possession. From the early patents granted to English navigators no results followed; and in North America, France took the lead. Breton and Norman sailors fished the coasts of Newfoundland; schemes of colonisation floated in the minds of Francis I. and his advisers. In 1518 De Lery set out on

an unsuccessful expedition to plant a French settlement in the New World. In 1524 Verrazani explored the American coast for the King of France. Ten years later Jacques Cartier, a mariner of St. Malo, discovered the river which he named the St. Lawrence. It was supposed that a country lying in the latitude of southern France would be blessed with a genial climate. Full of these hopes, Francis I. issued a commission to plant a colony many years before Elizabeth waved her hand to Frobisher, or granted a patent to Raleigh. In May, 1535, three well-manned ships sailed from St. Malo. Cartier and his followers received the blessing of the bishop; the king, the nobility, and the clergy were interested in their fortunes. Both in Hindostan and in North America, France preceded England with a systematic scheme for acquiring new territory. While English adventurers swept the seas as freebooters, or sought Arctic Eldorados, or searched for a north-west passage to Cathay, France formed a plan of territorial expansion which should not only supply the mother country with a revenue, but create new marts for her trade, and establish new centres of industry. Cartier sailed up the St. Lawrence, gave the name of Montreal to the royal mount which overhung the Indian village of Hochelaga, but founded no permanent settlement. The severity of the winter, for which his previous visit had not prepared him, appalled the intending colonists. Subsequent attempts were not more successful. War at home and abroad for the time diverted the attention of France from the New World. Yet, more than half a century before the voyage of the 'Mayflower,' Coligny established colonies as refuges for persecuted religion. The first Huguenot colony was planted in Brazil, in 1558; a second in 1562, in Carolina; a third in Florida, in 1565. The settlements were short-lived. The first was destroyed by the Portuguese; the second broke up from internal discord; the colonists of the third were massacred by Menendez and the Spaniards.

It was not till the seventeenth century that the French acquired a permanent footing in North America. The founder of 'New France' was Samuel de Champlain, a native of Saintonge, born at Brouage, on the Bay of Biscay. After fighting in the wars of the League he journeyed through the West Indies and Mexico, and eventually made his way to Panama. 'Here, more than two centuries and a half ago, his bold and active mind conceived the plan of a ship canal across the Isthmus, by which, he says, "the " voyage to the south seas would be shortened by more

‘ “ than fifteen hundred leagues.” ’ Whatever of romance the story of Canadian colonisation contains is centred in the person of Champlain. Enthusiastic for the spread of the Catholic faith, inspired by an absorbing passion for discovery, he is the knight-errant of French exploration. The manuscript journal of his voyages, quaintly illustrated by his own hand, is still preserved at Dieppe. In 1602 he was sent to explore the St. Lawrence. Two years later he sailed with a motley crew of adventurers and gaol-birds, Catholic priests and Huguenot pastors, to found at Port Royal in Acadia the first agricultural colony which Europe established in America. In 1608 he started on a new expedition from Honfleur, reached the St. Lawrence, and landed at Quebec.

‘ A few weeks passed,’ writes Mr. Parkman, ‘ and a pile of wooden buildings rose on the brink of the St. Lawrence, on or near the site of the market-place of the Lower Town of Quebec. The pencil of Champlain, always regardless of proportion and perspective, has preserved its semblance. A strong wooden wall, surmounted by a gallery, loopholed for musketry, enclosed three buildings, containing quarters for himself and his men, together with a courtyard, from one side of which rose a tall dove-cot, like a belfry. A moat surrounded the whole, and two or three small cannon were planted on salient platforms towards the river. There was a large magazine near at hand, and a part of the adjacent ground was laid out as a garden.’ (*Pioneers of New France*, pp. 302-3.)

From 1608 to 1763 the history of the French in Canada falls roughly into three periods. The first closes in 1629 with the foundation of the Company of New France and the temporary surrender of Quebec to the English; the second is the period of missionary enterprise, the thirty-three years of Jesuit ascendancy; the third extends from 1665 to 1763, when Canada was a fur-trading station and a military colony.

Throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries the colonial rivalry of France and England ran high. The influence of the New World on European politics has been under-estimated. So early as 1613 and 1628, Acadia and Canada were objects of English attack. Colonial competition involved England in wars with Spain and Holland, and extended the range of the war with France in 1689; it prolonged, if it did not originate, the wars of the Spanish succession; finally, it engaged England in a struggle with the French, which lasted for nearly a hundred years. The expansionist policy of Richelieu was continued by his suc-

cessors. Under Colbert and Seignelay, France became a great naval power; she chartered her companies of the north with a monopoly of the trade with Hudson's Bay, of the East and West Indies, of Senegal, and of Guinea; she planted settlements at Cayenne, St. Christopher, Guadeloupe, Martinique, and San Domingo; she established a footing at Pondicherry; she hoped to find in Madagascar a second Java. Before the close of the seventeenth century she claimed, on the mainland of America, Florida, Texas, Hudson's Bay, and parts of the states of New York, Vermont, and Maine. Her dominions stretched from the Alleghany to the Rocky Mountains, and from the mouth of the St. Lawrence to the mouth of the Mississippi; she held the two outlets of this vast territory with Quebec, the capital of Canada, and New Orleans, the metropolis of Louisiana. Her missionaries penetrated into every part of the country which she claimed. In conciliating native races she was unrivalled; her religion and her language were spreading over the whole of the new Continent. The English colonists held only a narrow strip of coast hemmed in between New France and the sea. A majestic future seemed to lie before France; everything pointed to her supremacy in North America. But piece by piece during the eighteenth century she was stripped of her colonial dominions till they dwindled to nothing. Acadia in 1713, and Canada in 1763, passed into the hands of England; her forts on the Ohio were captured. Finally, after many vicissitudes, Louisiana was sold to the United States by Napoleon, who pocketed the purchase-money. The Seven Years' War crippled her commerce, ruined her influence in America and India, destroyed her position as a colonial power. Nothing remained of New France in North America but the cod-fishing islets of St. Pierre and Miquelon. The memory of her Canadian occupation lingers in the nomenclature of the country, the language and character of the population; her law still forms the basis of the law of property; her Church continues to predominate; in the distribution and tenure of land, the influence of her feudal system is not yet extinct. But these traces of her rule survive only as monuments of the decay of her fortunes and the errors of her colonial policy.

It is remarkable that the recent rising of the French half-breeds in the North-West indicates the existence of the last traces of the long contest which raged so fiercely in the last century. Whatever the alleged grievances of the followers of Riel in the late rebellion may be, the real origin of the

quarrel lay in the undying hostility of race and religion to British ascendancy which still exists amongst a small and feeble portion of the population of North-Western Canada. Their language is French, and their religion is Roman Catholic. The priests, we have reason to believe, played an important part in instigating the rebellion, and although it has been easily, and we hope effectually, suppressed, this last explosion of French nationality and religious intolerance in Canada has excited the sympathies of the French Canadians in the lower province, who have no grievance of their own to complain of.

The subject of Mr. Parkman's historical series is the rise and fall of the French power in North America. Like the historian of the Spanish conquest in South America, he writes under severe physical disadvantages. Continual ill-health, which narrowly limited, and for several years wholly precluded, mental labour, and a condition of eyesight which 'never permitted reading or writing continuously for much more than five minutes, and often has never permitted them at all'—are obstacles which to most men would have proved absolutely insurmountable. Mr. Parkman's apology, if such it be, is wholly unnecessary. His volumes show no trace of the disadvantageous conditions of their production. On the contrary they contain a mass of new matter, which could only be collected by indefatigable research among original sources. The bulk of his material is gathered from manuscript and unpublished authorities collected in the public and private libraries of Europe and America. Above all he has drawn largely from the voluminous collections belonging to the French Government, contained in the Bibliothèque Nationale, the Archives de la Marine et des Colonies, and the Archives Nationales. Mr. Parkman treats his subject without reserve or partiality, and tells the story with vigour and picturesqueness. One advantage results from the author's ill-health. He has studied in the open air the scenes of his narrative, has lived in camps with the tribes of the prairies, and followed the tracks of the 'coureurs de bois' and rangers. Hence his pages are bright (sometimes too bright) with local colouring, and he depicts Indian life and struggles with singular force and vivacity. Nor is Mr. Parkman only a landscape painter; his portraits are firmly drawn. Laval, La Salle, Frontenac, and Montcalm stand out from his canvas instinct with life and individuality. On the other hand, the style is often too ornate and pretentious for English taste. Though this fault becomes less

marked in his later volumes, it is still conspicuous in 'Montcalm and Wolfe.' But this blemish does not seriously impair the great merits of his work. The number of editions through which portions of the series have passed in America attest their popularity in the country of its birth. But the 'History of New France' deserves among Englishmen a wider recognition than it has yet received. The subject is one of special interest. Not only does it deal with the infancy of a colony of whose growth England is justly proud, but the last two volumes contain the most complete account of the American side of the Seven Years' War which 'made England what she is, and supplied to the United States 'the indispensable condition of their greatness, if not of their 'national existence.' The events of that war do not fall within the scope of the present article. To complete his series of works on the French in North America, Mr. Parkman has so far departed from chronological sequence as to leave a gap of fifty years, from the Peace of Ryswick to the Peace of Aix-la-Chapelle. Till this interval is filled, the war between the two rivals for the possession of North America—which commenced in 1689 and continued with little real intermission till the Peace of Paris—cannot be treated as a whole. Partly for this reason, partly because the causes of the loss of Canada are to be sought in her earlier history, partly also because the events of this later period are comparatively familiar, our object is to trace, with Mr. Parkman's aid, the foundation, not the fall, of the French power in Canada.

Unlike the nations of the Old World, Canada has no mythic heroes; her remote past is not pieced out with webs of fiction, woven by the imagination of more polished ages. Yet, like the legendary founder of a European state, the figure of Champlain stands out alone in the opening scenes of the French occupation of North America. In geographical science he was not beyond his age. The dream of a northern sea, which would open a route to China and Japan, was always in his mind. By aiding the Hurons and Algonquins against the Iroquois, he secured the aid of the former two tribes in his explorations. The policy which he inaugurated was steadily pursued by his successors. English schemes of colonisation ignored the Red Indians; to attach them to France was always the policy of the French. Champlain joined the war parties of the Hurons, and tried to teach them military tactics; but it was his white complexion, his coat of mail, and, above all, his arquebuse, which made him

the umpire of Indian quarrels. Rather a soldier than a statesman, he left as a legacy to the French Canadians the undying hostility of the Iroquois, the most formidable of the savage tribes. One of his last acts was to petition Richelieu to destroy the dangerous enemy whom he had provoked. In his intrepid search for a passage to China, he discovered Lake Champlain, penetrated to Lake Nipissing, crossed Lake Ontario, explored the 'mer douce' of the Hurons. His activity was indefatigable. He crossed the sea repeatedly to promote the interests of the colony. Keenly alive to the spiritual, as well as material, welfare of Canada, he made Quebec not only a trading station but a mission. His life testified to the reality of his piety; the purity of his morals made a lasting impression on the Hurons. A fervent Catholic, he was jealous for the conversion of the heathen, who lived, as he said, 'like brute beasts, without faith, without religion, without God.' Near Brouage was a convent of Recollet Friars. Fired by his enthusiasm, several of the brotherhood volunteered their aid; but the Franciscan mendicants were too poor to send out missionaries. Champlain repaired to Paris, obtained the royal authority and the papal sanction for the mission, and collected funds for its equipment. In May 1615 he returned to Quebec with four Recollet Friars. It was a heavy blow when the assignment in 1621 of the trade monopoly to two Huguenot brothers filled Quebec with Protestant merchants. Four years later the Jesuits, whose jealousy of the Recollets equalled their hatred of the Huguenots, obtained a footing in Canada. Not only was the colony divided by religious disputes, but it was subjected to frequent changes of government, starved by selfish monopolists, fettered by harassing restrictions. Patents were granted and suspended; monopolies created or extinguished; the governorship changed hands repeatedly; within a few years there were five lieutenant-generals of New France. Nearly all the emigrants lived on supplies from home; few supported themselves; the majority spent their time in idling, drinking, gambling, or hunting. Disputes between rival traders, or between Catholics and Huguenots, kept the settlement in perpetual ferment. Trade was ruined by restrictions; neither men nor money could be found to repair the ruinous fort of St. Louis; the Iroquois prowled round Quebec, murdering stragglers, and threatening indiscriminate massacre. It is not surprising that the progress of the colony was slow. In 1628 the whole population of Quebec had risen to only 105

persons—men, women, and children. There were but three other trading stations, at Trois Rivières, the Rapids of St. Louis, and Tadoussac.

But an important change was at hand. Richelieu, who had suppressed the office of Admiral of France, and constituted himself 'Grand Master and Superintendent of Navigation and Commerce,' turned his attention to the colonial expansion of France. In 1627 a company was formed, called the Company of New France, consisting of one hundred associates, among whom were Richelieu and Champlain. On this body, owing to the Crown only fealty and homage, was conferred the whole of New France, from Florida to the Arctic circle, and from Newfoundland to the sources of the St. Lawrence, with large monopolies of the fur trade and other commerce. In return for these advantages, the company bound itself 'to convey to New France, during the year 1628, two or three hundred men of all trades, and, before the year 1643, to increase the number to four thousand persons, of both sexes, to lodge and support them for three years; and, this time expired, to give them cleared lands for their maintenance.' None but Catholics might settle; to every settlement three priests were to be attached; no Huguenot was to land in New France.

Before the company had entered on its new possessions, war broke out between France and England. The Huguenots, furious at their exclusion from the country, instigated England to seize the French possessions in North America. In July 1629 Champlain and the starving population of Quebec capitulated to Admiral Kirk, who planted the English flag on the fort of St. Louis. By the convention of Suza New France was restored, but it was not till May 1633 that Champlain, 'commissioned anew by Richelieu, assumed command at Quebec on behalf of the company.' Before his death, at Christmas 1635, the new era had begun. The Recollets were driven from the field; the Jesuits were masters of the situation. The Mission House of 'Notre Dame des Anges' already contained six Jesuit fathers. They preached, sang vespers, said mass, heard confessions, catechised, taught, tilled the land, cared for their cattle, ruled the colony from the governor downwards, and yet found time to practise snowshoes and master the native languages. At Champlain's table, in the fort of Quebec, 'histories and lives of saints were read aloud, as in a monastic refectory. Prayers, masses, and confessions followed each other with edifying regularity, and the bell of the adjacent chapel,

'built by Champlain, rang morning, noon, and night. God-less soldiers caught the infection, and whipped themselves in penance for their sins. Debauched artisans outdid each other in the fury of their contrition. Quebec had become a mission.'

For the next thirty years Canadian history is bound up with that of the Jesuits. On their side were zeal, wealth, ability, court influence. They were the main support of the military power, the principal agents of trade, the instruments of political expansion, and the pioneers of exploration. To religious propagandism all other considerations were subordinated. The early governors were half missionaries. Champlain was eager for the conversion of the Indians; Montmagny was a Knight of Malta; Maisonneuve, the military leader of the settlement of Montreal, consecrated his sword to the Church; 'D'Ailleboul lived with his wife 'like monk and nun.' The Jesuits aimed at laying the foundations of temporal dominion in the hearts and consciences of the savages. If the Red Indians could be converted to the Faith, an empire, which might embrace the continent, would be established, bound together in allegiance to France by the strong band of religion. On the success of the Jesuits depended both commerce and policy. If heroic courage and unselfish zeal could command success, the Jesuits would have christianised North America. Their missionary annals rival, in deeds of chivalrous daring, the tales of knight-errantry or the legends of the saints, with which Ignatius Loyola solaced his sickness. Fervent in their master's cause, strong in religious enthusiasm, they laboured in North America with all-embracing activity to advance the interests of their order, of the Papacy, and of France. Directed, disciplined, impelled, restrained by one master-hand, yielding obedience as complete and unresisting as that of a corpse, they impressed on the world the tremendous power of their organisation. If Xavier alone has become the canonised saint of Christendom, many of his brethren were heroes of no common stamp. In China, Japan, Thibet, Brazil, California, Abyssinia, and Caffreland, they performed miracles of self-denying devotion. Above all, in North America, men like Le Jeune, Jogues, Brébeuf, Garnier, Chaumonot, braved famine, solitude, insult, persecution, defied intolerable and inexpressible torture, tasted day after day the prolonged bitterness of death in its most appalling forms.

At first the labours of the Jesuits lay among the Algonquin

children. Le Jeune took his stand, like Xavier in Goa, at the door of the mission-house, and rang his bell. The assembled children were shown the sign of the cross, taught to repeat portions of the church services, catechised, and dismissed with porringers of peas as inducements to return. But no permanent results could be obtained among the wandering Algonquin hordes. Le Jeune determined to establish missions among the numerous Huron tribes who lived in stationary settlements, on the shores of the western lakes. In 1634, Brébeuf, Daniel, and Davost left Trois Rivières for Lake Huron. The hardships of the voyage, which lasted thirty days, were so severe that even the iron frame of Brébeuf almost succumbed. Mr. Parkman quotes, from a paper printed by the Jesuits of Paris, a series of minute instructions for the conduct on this river route of 'les Pères de nostre Compagnie qui seront enuoiez aux Hurons.' The directions are full of tact:—

'Never make them [the Indians] wait for you in embarking. Take a flint and steel to light their pipes and kindle their fire at night; for these little services win their hearts. Try to eat their sagamite as they cook it, bad and dirty as it is. Fasten up your cassock, that you may not carry water or sand into the canoe. Wear no shoes or stockings in the canoe, but you may put them on in crossing the portages. Do not ask them too many questions. Bear their faults in silence, and appear always cheerful. Do not make yourself troublesome even to a single Indian. Buy fish for them from the tribes you will pass; and for this purpose take with you some awls, beads, knives, and fish-hooks. Be not ceremonious with the Indians; take at once what they offer you; ceremony offends them. Be very careful, when in the canoe, that the brim of your hat does not annoy them. Perhaps it would be better to wear your nightcap. There is no such thing as impropriety among the Indians. Remember that it is Christ and his cross that you are seeking; and if you aim at anything else, you will get nothing but affliction for body and mind.' ('Jesuits in North America,' pp. 54-55.)

Partly from curiosity, partly from fear of offending the French at Quebec, partly from superstitious awe, the Jesuits were permitted to settle and build houses in the Huron towns. In France the utmost enthusiasm was aroused for the mission; Brébeuf's 'Relation' produced a prodigious effect; as time wore on, more Jesuits crossed the sea to aid the work of conversion. The central mission-house, near Lake Huron, served as residence, hospital, magazine, and refuge in case of need. The Huron towns, all named after saints, were divided into districts, to each of which two priests were assigned. The missionaries journeyed singly

or in pairs from village to village, till every Huron settlement had heard the new doctrine. Their circuits were made in the depth of winter, for it was not till November or December that the Indians settled in their villages. The Jesuits paid for their lodgings with needles, beads, awls, and other small articles. They taught the Hurons to fortify their towns, doctored the sick, instructed children, preached to the adults. But converts were hard to make, and harder still to retain. Fear was the principal agent of conversion, and pictures were invaluable. Le Jeune writes home for pictures of hell, in which 'devils were painted ' tormenting a soul with different punishments, one applying ' fire, another serpents, another tearing him with pincers, ' and another holding him fast with a chain.' Garnier, asking a friend in France to send him pictures, shows an intimate knowledge of Indian peculiarities. 'Send me,' he writes, 'a picture of Christ without a beard.' A variety of souls in perdition are requested. 'Particular directions ' are given with respect to the demons, dragons, flames, ' and other essentials of these works of art. Of souls in ' bliss he thinks that one will be enough. All the pictures ' must be in full face, not in profile; and they must look ' directly at the beholder, with open eyes. The colours ' should be bright.' Mr. Parkman notices the Indian dislike of a beard, and quotes the instance of a fatal quarrel which was caused among the Sioux by Catlin representing one of them in profile. But, if the Jesuits converted few of the savages, they gained personal influence. Their disinterestedness, intrepidity, and blameless lives gradually told upon the Indians. Their patience and tact were never at fault. 'Pour convertir les sauvages,' says a passage in the 'Divers Sentiments,' 'il n'y faut pas tant ' de science que de bonté et vertu bien solide. Ils n'entendent pas bien nostre Theologie, mais ils entendent parfaitement bien nostre humilité et nostre affabilité et se ' laissent gagner.' Their most determined enemies were the sorcerers, medicine-men, and diviners who swarmed in every village. To the Hurons the priests appeared as rival magicians. They looked upon the black-robed strangers as 'Okies,' or supernatural beings, masters of life and death, controlling the sun and the moon and the seasons. They attributed to them the changes in the weather, the scantiness or abundance of their crops; they came to them for spells to destroy their enemies, for charms to kill grasshoppers. Brébeuf foretold an eclipse, and his prophecy was

fulfilled; the native sorcerers failed to obtain rain; nine masses to St. Joseph broke up the obstinate drought. But the triumph was not an unmixed advantage. Pestilence and small-pox decimated the people; the medicine-men, unable to check its ravages, whispered that the Jesuits themselves caused the pest. 'Some said that they concealed 'in their houses a corpse which infected the country, a perverted notion derived from some half-instructed neophyte 'concerning the body of Christ in the Eucharist.' The lives of the Fathers hung upon a thread. Again and again nothing saved them but their unflinching courage. They could not leave their houses without danger of being brained: Chaumonot was once actually struck down. So hopeless were they of escape, that they wrote a farewell letter to the Father Superior, and entrusted it to a faithful convert. Even when the immediate danger had passed away, they were exposed to every sort of insult. It was many years before their persecution as sorcerers ceased. Surrounded by frightful dangers, hedged in by the gloom of pathless forests, isolated from their fellow-countrymen and often from each other, the perpetual tension of their nerves combined with the ecstatic exaltation of their faith to bring heaven and hell very near to their lives. So powerfully realised was the conflict in which they were engaged, in so dramatic a form was it presented to their overwrought imaginations, that supernatural visions and visitations were of frequent occurrence. The Huron country was the stronghold of Satan, 'comme un donjon des demons.' The Jesuits and the hosts of heaven waged war against the legions of hell for the possession of the land. Death, like a skeleton, threatened them; troops of fiends in the form of men or of animals surrounded them: they heard the roaring of demons, and saw spectres armed with javelins, and earth and hell raging against them. On the other hand the vision of a gorgeous palace floated before them, and a miraculous voice assured them it was the destined abode of those who dwelt in savage hovels for the love of God: the Virgin and St. Joseph encouraged them with their presence; St. Michael gave them his protection: Father Daniel appeared after his death with a radiant countenance, and they knew that, though they had lost a brother from their midst, they had gained an intercessor in heaven.

In the winter of 1640 Brébeuf saw a great cross slowly approaching the mission of Ste. Marie from the country of the Iroquois. The ominous vision was fearfully realised.

Up to this time, though the lives of the missionaries were living martyrdoms, no priest had been put to death. But, if the blood of martyrs is the seed of the Church, the harvest should have been great in North America. Within the next ten years De Nouë, Goupil, Jogues, Lalande, Daniel, Buteux, Garnier, Lalemant, Brébeuf fell victims to their heroic enterprise. The five confederate nations of the Iroquois tribe (Senecas, Cayugas, Onondagas, Oneidas, and Mohawks) had never forgotten the assistance which Champlain rendered to the Hurons. War raged uninterruptedly between them and the French and their Indian allies. The Iroquois hovered round the French settlements, cut off stragglers, lured parties into ambushes, harassed the colonists by day and night. In all Canada 'no man could hunt, fish, 'till the fields, or cut a tree in the forest without peril to his 'scalp.' There was no safety outside the palisades of Quebec, Three Rivers, Montreal, and the fort of Richelieu. 'I had as lief,' writes Father Vimont, 'be beset by goblins 'as by the Iroquois. The one are about as invisible as the 'other. Our people on the Richelieu and at Montreal are 'kept in a closer confinement than ever were monks or nuns 'in our smallest convents in France.' Tracking the slightest trails with unerring sagacity and untiring patience, skulking in ambush for days and weeks, coming and going with the stealthiness and rapidity of wild animals, they kept the whole colony in a perpetual fever of anxiety, destroyed the fur trade, and for three years severed all communication with the Huron mission. In 1642 the priests were without clothes; they had no vessels for the altars, or sacrificial wine; they had exhausted their writing materials. Father Jogues volunteered to accompany the Huron fur-traders on a voyage to Quebec to procure supplies. On the return voyage the Iroquois surprised the Huron canoes, and carried off Jogues with two young *donnés* of the mission as prisoners. They beat him senseless with their clubs, and, when he revived, tore away his finger-nails with their teeth, and gnawed his hands like famished dogs. After an eight days' march under a blazing sun, his captors reached their first camp. There he was made to run the gauntlet: his hands were again mangled; fire was applied to every part of his body; and when at night he tried to rest, 'the young warriors 'came to lacerate his wounds and pull out his hair and 'beard.' The march was resumed for five days longer, till the band reached the Mohawk town which was their goal. There for the second time Jogues passed 'through the

'narrow road of Paradise,' was unmercifully beaten, and then tortured with such exquisite ingenuity that the greatest suffering was inflicted without endangering life. At night he was 'stretched on his back, with his hands extended, and 'his ankles and wrists bound fast to stakes driven into the 'earthen floor. The children now profited by the example 'of their parents, and amused themselves by placing live 'coals on the naked bodies of their prisoners, who, bound 'fast and covered with wounds and bruises, which made 'every movement a torture, were sometimes unable to shake 'them off.' For three consecutive days the torture continued; in two other Mohawk towns they subsequently endured a repetition of their sufferings. Yet throughout Jogues encouraged his fellow countrymen, converted some of the Huron prisoners, and baptised them with his mangled hands. The sequel of his story and his ultimate escape to France are well told by Mr. Parkman. Still Jogues had the heroism to return to Canada. Four years later negotiations were opened with the Iroquois. He was chosen as the French emissary, to act as political agent, and to found a mission, prophetically called the 'Mission of the Martyrs.' For a moment he recoiled; but the weakness was transient. He set out with a presentiment of his death. 'Ibo et non 'redibo,' he wrote in a farewell letter to a friend. His foreboding was realised. After once more undergoing torture, he was mercifully brained with a hatchet.

In the heroism of his life and death he was, before three years had passed, equalled by more than one of his brethren. To the advantages of compact organisation which they possessed over other tribes, the Iroquois now added superiority in weapons. By the purchase of arquebuses from the Dutch traders of Albany, they had become masters of the French thunderbolts. Emboldened by success they aimed at the annihilation of the Hurons. They called the French cowards, openly attacked their forts, and threatened to exterminate them, and carry the 'white girls,' meaning the nuns, to their villages. On the other hand, the Hurons were dying out. They dared not cultivate crops, hunt, or trade with Quebec for fear of the Iroquois. Famine, pestilence, and war thinned their numbers. Their spirit, though capable of spasmodic outbursts, was broken. Like a doomed people, they were sunk in dejection, paralysed with fear, incapable of defending themselves. They flocked in crowds to the priests; charity was made an engine of conversion; thousands were fed at Ste. Marie; converts were baptised by hundreds. In

many of the towns the Christians outnumbered the heathens; they abandoned cannibalism, ceased to burn their prisoners, discontinued their diabolic games, feasts, and dances. Never had the future of the mission seemed more hopeful.

But at the moment when the prospect of the Jesuits seemed brightest, their labour of years was on the eve of destruction. The Iroquois abandoned their inroads of small scalping parties for an invasion in force. In the summer of 1648 the Huron town of St. Joseph was burned; the inhabitants massacred; the mission-house destroyed; Daniel, its priest, shot dead, gasping with his latest breath the name of Jesus. Eight months later, in March 1649, St. Louis and St. Ignace were taken and burnt; the two priests, Brébeuf and Lalemant, were captured alive. Brébeuf's fate is described below. Without leaders and without organisation, starving, helpless with panic, the Hurons attempted no resistance. They abandoned their settlements. 'Some roamed northward and eastward through the half-thawed wilderness; some hid themselves on rocks or islands of Lake Huron; some sought an asylum among the Tobacco Nation; a few joined the Neutrals on the north of Lake Erie. The Hurons, as a nation, ceased to exist.' There was no longer any reason for the maintenance of the mission: Ste. Marie was abandoned. In June 1650 the miserable remnant of the Huron nation was conveyed to the shelter of the fort of Quebec. With the ruin of their mission was dispelled the Jesuit dream of a Christian empire; many of the priests went back to France 'resolved,' writes the Father Superior (Lalemant), 'to return to the combat at the first sound of the trumpet.' Others, following their wandering flocks to the north and west, founded new missions on Lake Huron, Lake Superior, and Lake Michigan.

The last scene of this tragedy may be appropriately closed with the fate of Brébeuf. He had spent the winter of 1625-6 among the Algonquins; for the next three years he laboured among the Hurons. His mission was interrupted by the English occupation of Quebec; but he was the first of the Jesuits to reach the country in 1634. When he arrived at the Huron town of Ihonativa, 'a crowd ran out to meet him; "Echom has come again! Echom has come again!" they cried, recognising the stately figure, robed in black, that advanced from the border of the forest.' From 1634 to 1649 he was one of the mainstays of the mission. On the afternoon of March 16, 1649, the day on which he and Lalemant, the nephew of the Superior, had been captured,

'Brébeuf was led apart and bound to a stake. He seemed more concerned for his captive converts than for himself, and addressed them in a loud voice, exhorting them to suffer patiently, and promising heaven as their reward. The Iroquois, incensed, scorched him from head to foot, to silence him; whereupon, in the tone of a master, he threatened them with everlasting flames for persecuting the worshippers of God. As he continued to speak, with voice and countenance unchanged, they cut away his lower lip, and thrust a red-hot iron down his throat. He still held his tall form erect and defiant, with no sign or sound of pain; and they tried other means to overcome him. They led out Lalemant, that Brébeuf might see him tortured. They had tied strips of bark, smeared with pitch, about his naked body. When he saw the condition of his Superior, he could not hide his agitation, and called out to him with a broken voice, in the words of St. Paul, "We are made a spectacle to the world, to angels, and to men." Then he threw himself at Brébeuf's feet; upon which the Iroquois seized him, made him fast to a stake, and set fire to the bark that enveloped him. As the flame rose, he threw his arms upward, with a shriek of supplication to Heaven. Next they hung round Brébeuf's neck a collar made of hatchets heated red-hot; but the indomitable priest stood like a rock. A Huron in the crowd, who had been a convert of the mission, but was now an Iroquois by adoption, called out, with the malice of a renegade, to pour hot water on their heads, since they had poured so much cold water on the heads of others. The kettle was accordingly slung, and the water boiled and poured slowly on the heads of the two missionaries. "We baptise you," they cried, "that you may be happy in heaven; for nobody can be saved without a good baptism." Brébeuf would not flinch; and, in a rage, they cut strips of flesh from his limbs, and devoured them before his eyes. After a succession of other revolting tortures, they scalped him; when, seeing him nearly dead, they laid open his breast, and came in a crowd to drink the blood of so valiant an enemy, thinking to imbibe with it some portion of his courage. A chief then tore out his heart and devoured it. Thus died Jean de Brébeuf, the founder of the Huron mission, its truest hero and its greatest martyr.' (*Jesuits in North America*, pp. 388-9.)

If the Red Indians could ever have been tamed, the Jesuits would have performed the task. The Huron Mission had failed, but they did not despair. They had experienced the ferocious cruelty of the Iroquois, yet their Order contained men courageous enough to attempt their conversion. As political agents the Jesuits saw the value of their alliance. Lying between Canada and the Dutch and English settlements, the Iroquois country was the highway of commerce with the West. The Jesuits hoped to ally the Indians against the heretics of New Amsterdam and New England, to monopolise the fur trade with the interior, to secure not only peace for Canada, but a barrier against her European

rivals. Conversion to the Catholic faith was once more the means by which they hoped to cement the alliance. In 1653 a short lull occurred in the perpetual wars waged by the Iroquois against the French. They were anxious for peace and even for the establishment of a mission and a colony. Apparently the object of the Iroquois was thus to lure into their power the Christian Hurons; from the first they intended to massacre the colonists. With devoted zeal the Jesuits accepted the proposal. 'The blood of the martyrs,' said one of them, 'is the seed of the Church, and if we die 'by the fires of the Iroquois, we shall have won eternal life 'by snatching souls from the fires of hell.' Le Mercier, the Superior, with three other Jesuits, two lay brethren, forty or fifty Frenchmen, and a large number of the Christian Hurons, set out up the St. Lawrence, across Lake Ontario, up the Oswego to Lake Onondaga. There, on a spot still known as the Jesuits' Well, they founded the mission of Ste. Marie, at once as a religious and political outwork. For nearly a year they preached, taught, and catechised. During the greater part of the time their deaths had been decreed; the day and hour were revealed by a dying convert. Hastily summoning the priests from the detached missions, the fifty-three colonists assembled in the fortified house at Ste. Marie. The sequel well illustrates the courage and address with which the Jesuits confronted danger. If they escaped by sanctioning a superstition which they had before denounced as diabolical, the harshest critic cannot condemn their pliancy. The ruse is far removed from their adoption of the heathen rites of China and Malabar. They collected eighteen canoes, and secretly prepared, in the loft of the mission, two flat boats; with these they had sufficient means of transport. But a crowd of Onondagas were already bivouacked between them and the lake, lounging round the house, smoking their pipes, and preserving the friendliest demeanour. There seemed no mode of escape. From this desperate peril they extricated themselves by a 'festin à 'manger tout.' A young Frenchman, the adopted son of an Iroquois chief, told his Indian father that he was warned in a dream of approaching death, unless the spirits were appeased by a medicine feast. At these meals everything set before the guests must be eaten, or the spirits were not propitiated. The Jesuits killed their hogs and poultry, and ransacked their stores for the feast; games occupied the afternoon; in the evening the meal began. Seated gravely in a ring, their Indian guests fell to their work, while the

French musicians encouraged their efforts with drums, trumpets, and singing.

‘Under cover of the din, the boats were carried from the rear of the mission-house to the borders of the lake. It was nearly eleven o’clock. The miserable guests were choking with repletion. They prayed the young Frenchman to dispense them from further surfeit. “Will you suffer me to die?” he asked, in piteous tones. They bent to their task again, but Nature soon reached her utmost limit; and they sat helpless as a conventicle of gorged turkey-buzzards, without the power possessed by those unseemly birds to rid themselves of the burden. “That will do,” said the young man, “you have eaten enough; my life is saved. Now you can sleep till we come in the morning to waken you for prayers.” And one of his companions played soft airs on a violin to lull them to repose. Soon all were asleep, or in a lethargy akin to sleep. The few remaining Frenchmen now silently withdrew, and cautiously descended to the shore, where their comrades, already embarked, lay on their oars anxiously awaiting them. Snow was falling fast as they pushed out upon the murky waters. . . . When day broke, Lake Onondaga was far behind, and around them was the leafless, lifeless forest.’ (*Old Régime in Canada*, pp. 38–39.)

The Iroquois mission, like that to the Hurons, had proved a disastrous failure.

The period of missionary enterprise was drawing to a close; its end was accelerated by the renewal of hostilities by the Iroquois. In the art of savage war the few scattered colonists were no match for the Indians, who, wrote a Jesuit, ‘approach like foxes, attack like lions, and disappear like birds.’ The woods swarmed with these invisible foes. In the daytime they surprised workers in the fields; at night they prowled round the houses, ready to brain stray inhabitants. ‘They haunt us,’ cried the despairing Father Superior, ‘like persecuting goblins. They kill our new-made Christians in our arms. If they meet us on the river, they kill us. If they find us in the huts of our Indians, they burn us and them together.’ They landed close to Quebec, and carried off the Christian Hurons as prisoners. Even in the Fort of St. Louis, the governor was startled by their war-whoops. Governor after governor vainly petitioned for troops. While the Iroquois were at war the colony starved, for the fur trade was destroyed; no money could be obtained to repair the decaying fortifications. Deeds of surpassing heroism, like that of Daulac at Long Saut, might save the colony for a time, but it plainly must succumb at last. Everything had been staked on the efficacy of the missions, and the missions had failed.

In 1659 the whole population of Canada, priests, nuns,

settlers, and traders, did not exceed 2,500 persons. During the summer the colonists hunted, fished, or tilled their scanty clearings; in the winter they hewed timber, split shingles, and sawed wood for the market at Quebec. But the colony was not agricultural, or even self-supporting. It depended on the fur trade with the Indian tribes of the West, supplemented by aid from home. The colonists were gathered in three principal stations—Montreal, Trois Rivières, and Quebec. Montreal was peculiarly exposed to the attacks of the Indians; it was the ‘Castle Dangerous’ of the colony. It contained ‘some forty small, compact’ houses ranged parallel to the river, chiefly along the line ‘of what is now St. Paul’s Street,’ protected by a square fort, and a massive stone windmill pierced with loopholes, built on the Point aux Trembles by the Sulpitian Fathers. Montreal contained about fifty families. In this advanced fort was the Sulpitian Mission, an Hôtel Dieu, and a school served by devoted nuns. Trois Rivières was a fur-trading station containing twenty-five houses, enclosed with a square palisade. In 1665 the Upper Town of Quebec on the promontory consisted almost entirely of ecclesiastical buildings, the church of Notre Dame, the Hôtel Dieu, the Ursuline Convent, where Mother Mary of the Incarnation ruled her pupils and her nuns, the buildings and church of the Jesuits, and Laval’s seminary. The stone-and-timber-built chateau of St. Louis, ‘the sénéchaussée, or court-house, the tavern’ of one Jacques Boisdon on the square near the church, and ‘a few houses along the line of what is now St. Louis Street, ‘comprised nearly all the civil part of the Upper Town.’ In the square, markets were held on Tuesdays and Fridays. ‘In the midst of the Lower Town stood the magazine of the ‘Company, with its two round towers and two projecting ‘wings. It was here that all the beaver-skins of the colony ‘were collected, assorted, and shipped for France.’ Smoking was forbidden in the streets, for the wooden roofs and fronts of the houses, and the piles of cordwood and hay by which they were surrounded, exposed the town to constant risk of fire. Above and below Quebec were a few outlying cabins built by the more adventurous settlers.

Severance from civilised life and the Old World fostered in the Canadian settlers a sense of their dependence. Like their mediæval ancestors, they felt the weakness of man and the strength of God, realised without an effort that invisible world which advancing civilisation destroys. Many of the ships which left France for Canada sailed from St. Malo; and not

a few of the colonists were Bretons, whose intense piety was coloured by the wild superstitions which are recorded in the 'Grand Insulaire et Pilotage' of André Thevet, and which, as M. Souvestre has told us, are yet cherished by 'les derniers Bretons.' Intensely ignorant, they were instructed by priests scarcely less superstitious than themselves. It is creditable to their spiritual rulers that no witches were discovered in Canada, and that the colony was free from 'New England tragedies.' But in a different direction their imaginations were wrought upon by their physical surroundings. Carrying their lives in their hands, ever encountering fresh wonders of nature, which seemed to render impossibilities possible, the Canadians saw and heard around them

' Calling shapes and beck'ning shadows dire,
And airy tongues that syllable men's names,
On sands and shores and desert wilderness.'

This incessant supernaturalism of the French Canadians is a striking feature in their early history. Like the New-England settlers, they believed that they had special claims to providential interventions and mysterious tokens, because, to their excited imaginations, the fiends of hell were leagued to baffle their enterprise. Miracles abounded; the Sulpitians vied with the Jesuits in their production. In 1658 portents and prodigies heralded the impending invasion of Quebec by the Iroquois. A blazing canoe sailed across the sky; the air was alive with confused cries and lamentations; a voice of thunder sounded from mid-heaven. Awful signs preceded the great earthquake of 1663, which came as a chastisement to the colony for its drunkenness. A globe of flame issued from the moon and disappeared behind the mountain above Montreal with a noise as loud as a cannon. Blazing serpents borne on wings of fire lighted up the night; voices sounded through the forest, proclaiming 'Strange things will happen to-day; the earth will quake!' four furious demons were seen shaking the four corners of Quebec, and were only restrained from reducing it to ruins by 'a person of admirable 'majesty and ravishing beauty,' who appeared in the midst of them. The Jesuits set forth on their missions to attack the demons in their very stronghold; and the same feeling was encouraged in the colonists. The Iroquois were regarded as the myrmidons of Satan; those who died in battle for Mary and her Divine Son were secure of paradise. The Catholics were the fold of Christ; their wars were crusades against the powers of evil. The island of Montreal was the pro-

perty of the Virgin Mary; its defenders were enrolled in a military fraternity as 'soldiers of the Holy Family of Jesus, Mary, and Joseph.' The outlying redoubts on the skirts of the settlement were called by the names of saints; the largest was the redoubt of the Infant Jesus. Tracy's expedition against the Iroquois in 1666 started 'on the day of the Exaltation of the Cross, for whose glory,' adds the chronicler, 'it was undertaken.' The soldiers were made to understand that the war was waged for the glory of God and the salvation of souls. Five hundred bore scapularies of the Holy Virgin.

Like the faith of the Puritans, their religious enthusiasm, heightened by the proximity of earthly and unearthly dangers, grew stern and sombre. The appalling severity of Canadian winters seemed to freeze up its founts of gentleness. It was alloyed with a bigotry scarcely less harsh than that described in the 'Scarlet Letter.' The atmosphere of colonial life was charged with gloom. The 'parti dévot' denounced costly apparel, feasts, balls, plays, late dinners, low-necked dresses, and knots of ribbons, with a severity less congenial to the mirth-loving Frenchman than to the grim and acrid elders of Salem. The Jesuits had established an Inquisition 'worse than that of Spain.' Not content with the confessional, they associated the women and girls of Quebec into a 'congregation of the Holy Family,' under a vow to tell every good or evil deed they knew of every person of their acquaintance. La Hontan complains that he could not go on a pleasure party, nor play a game of cards, nor visit the ladies, without being publicly attacked from the pulpit. He bitterly laments the destruction of his copy of 'Petronius,' which was expurgated by a zealous curé. Masqueraders were excommunicated; the priests forced themselves into private houses, carried off and whipped women who had been to a ball or worn a mask. At Montreal the Sulpitians built a house in which they shut up girls who caused scandal by their love of amusement. The Huguenot merchants of Rochelle were forbidden to exercise their religion, and could not winter in the colony without a license. No sooner did a ship arrive in the river than she was boarded by the Jesuits, who converted the heretics. So complete was the ascendancy of the Jesuits that when Louis XIV. empowered the Governor Denonville to imprison heretics or quarter the soldiery upon them, he replied, 'There is not a heretic here.'

United, the colonists could hardly make head against their

common foe. But their internal dissensions were bitter. Montreal claimed independence of Quebec; Jesuits contended with Sulpitians, Ultramontanes with Gallicans; Church and State were at open feud. The chief root of dissensions lay in the determination of the Jesuits to exalt the Church above the State. In their quarrel with the Sulpitians, they had right on their side. For thirty years they had themselves constituted the Canadian Church; they had endured privations and martyrdoms; the very existence of the colony was due to their efforts. But the seminary of St. Sulpice, now in charge of Montreal, aspired to give Canada a bishop from their brotherhood. They induced the Archbishop of Rouen to appoint Queylus, one of their body, his vicar-general in Canada. The Jesuits accepted his authority, but prepared to supersede it with that of their own representative. Their influence at court was great, and Anne of Austria invited them to nominate a bishop. Forbidden by the rules of their order to choose a bishop from their own body, their choice in 1659 fell on François Xavier Laval de Montmorency, Abbé de Montigny. Highly reputed for his sanctity, rich, nobly born, supported by the Jesuits, and a permanent official, in some degree independent of the Crown, 'the modest Levite,' as his biographers call him, became the first power in Canada. He belonged to the family of the famous Constable, the 'premier baron chrétien,' whose son Henry was the 'compère' of Henry of Navarre, and whose grandson was executed by Louis XIII. From his youth Laval had renounced the world. He received the tonsure when he was nine years old. Now, at the age of thirty-six, he was living in the Hermitage of Caen, a society founded to detect and extirpate Jansenism. At the Hermitage, Laval's

'ordinary occupations were prayer, mortification, instruction of the poor, and spiritual readings or conferences; his recreations were to labour in the hospitals, wait upon the sick and poor, make their beds, dress their wounds, and aid them in their most repulsive needs. . . . Yet, though living at this time in a state of habitual religious exaltation, he was by nature no mere dreamer; and in whatever heights his spirit might wander, his feet were always planted on the solid earth. His flaming zeal had for its servants a hard, practical nature, perfectly fitted for the battle of life, a narrow intellect, a stiff and persistent will, and, as his enemies thought, the love of domination native to his blood.'

'Several portraits of Laval are extant. A drooping nose of portentous size; a well-formed forehead; a brow strongly arched, a bright clear eye; scanty hair, half hidden by a black skull-cap; thin

lips, compressed and rigid, betraying a spirit not easy to move or convince; features of that indescribable cast which mark the priestly type; such is Laval, as he looks grimly down on us from the dingy canvas of two centuries ago.' (*Old Régime*, pp. 94-95, 104-5.)

Laval came out to New France as the creature of the Papacy. The concordat of Bologna was evaded on the plea that 'Canada, a country of infidel savages, was under the 'Papal jurisdiction.' He was appointed the Pope's Vicar-Apostolic for Canada, with the title of Bishop of Petràa in Arabia. It was not till 1674 that he was made Bishop of Quebec. His aim throughout was to assert the authority of the Church, which was lodged in himself. As a Catholic, a priest, and a man, he was irresistibly drawn to the side of centralisation and absolutism. Different views may be held of his policy, but to him, as the founder of the greater and lesser seminaries, designed for the instruction of a Canadian priesthood, and of the farm-school of St. Joachim, supplying technical education, Canada unquestionably owes a deep debt of gratitude. He acquired large tracts of land, and among them Beaupré, with which he endowed his educational establishments. From the revenues of this endowment, the greater and lesser seminaries are still supported; and from the same source was founded the Laval University, which commemorates his name. On the existing ecclesiastical system he has also left his mark. His despotic temper insisted that the Canadian curé should, unlike his French brother, be removable at the will of the bishop—not a fixture in his parish, but a missionary, coming and going at the bidding of his superior. Louis XIV. yielded the point with reluctance, but the system thus established still characterises the Canadian priesthood.

Intolerant of divided authority, Laval at once asserted his ecclesiastical supremacy by shipping Queylus off to France. A conflict with the governor, D'Argenson, and the civil power speedily followed. The points in dispute appeared trivial; in reality they involved the subordination of the State to the Church. So intolerable grew the friction that D'Argenson, partly through Laval's influence, was recalled. His successor, D'Avaugour, met with the same fate at the instance of the Bishop. The next governor, Saffray de Mézy, was selected by Laval; but, before the lapse of a year, his patron had procured his peremptory dismissal. Within six years Laval had made one governor, and overthrown three. He had exemplified the truth of a saying, imputed to him by D'Argenson, 'A bishop may do what he likes.'

But before the fall of Mézy the third period of Canadian history had commenced. By the failure of the Jesuit missions the dream of a theocratic empire was dispelled. Religion could not subdue the Iroquois; military force was imperatively needed to save the colony from destruction. The Jesuits recognised the changed situation. They laboured with the same devotion, though for a different object. They no longer sought to found a Christian kingdom, but to extend the possessions of their order. No longer paramount in the settled portions of the colony, they turned to the unexplored west, where they strove to reproduce the Utopias of Paraguay, from which other white men were excluded. Under these circumstances, the decline of ecclesiastical authority was accelerated by the completeness of its previous triumph. Though a pious Catholic, Louis XIV. was not the sovereign to endure a spiritual despotism; the successes of Laval proved Pyrrhic victories. Temporal interests and civil power gained the ascendancy; forts took the place of missions. By the side of and above the bishop stood the governor and the intendant, the three representing the threefold monopoly of religion, government, and trade. Every outlying station had its commandant, its storekeeper, and its priest.

Under Colbert's vigorous administration, the home government awoke to the potential value of Canada. D'Avaugour, whose dismissal Laval had procured, was a shrewd, energetic soldier. After his recall, he addressed to Colbert a memorial upon the colony, which produced a strong impression at Court:—

“The St. Lawrence,” he says, “is the entrance to what may be made the greatest state in the world;” and in his purely military way he recounts the means of realising this great possibility. Three thousand soldiers should be sent to the colony, to be discharged and turned into settlers after three years of service. During these three years they may make Quebec an impregnable fortress, subdue the Iroquois, build a strong fort on the river where the Dutch have a miserable redoubt, called Fort Orange (Albany), and finally open a way by that river to the sea. Thus the heretics will be driven out, and the King will be master of America, at a total cost of about four hundred thousand francs yearly for ten years.’ (*Old Régime*, p. 129.)

D'Avaugour's advice coincided with Colbert's schemes for the expansion of France. By an edict of May 1664, Louis XIV. created the Company of the West Indies, modelled upon the great trading corporations of Holland. To the Company of the West were transferred

‘Western Africa from Cape Verd to the Cape of Good Hope, South

America between the Amazon and the Orinoco, Cayenne, the Antilles, and all New France, from Hudson's Bay to Virginia and Florida, to be held of the Crown on the simple condition of faith and homage. As, according to the edict, the glory of God was the chief object in view, the Company was required to supply its possessions with a sufficient number of priests, and diligently to exclude all teachers of false doctrine.' (*Old Régime*, p. 174.)

The king exercised the right of nominating the rulers of his American dominions. In November 1763 the Marquis de Tracy was appointed lieutenant-governor of North and South America, and in March 1665 Daniel de Rémy, Sieur de Courcelle, and Jean-Baptiste Talon were sent out as governor and intendant of New France. On June 30, 1665, Tracy landed at Quebec, attended by a gorgeous retinue. His magnificence contrasted strangely with the dilapidated appearance of colonial surroundings. Laval, who awaited him at Notre Dame in full pontificals, attended by priests and Jesuits, alone vied with him in the externals of power. Throughout the season of 1665, soldiers, settlers, young women for wives, in all about 2,000 persons, and horses, sheep, and cattle in abundance were landed at the royal charges. 'At length,' writes Mother Jucherau, 'our joy was completed by the arrival of two vessels, with Monsieur de Courcelle, our governor, Monsieur Talon, our intendant, and the last companies of the regiment of Carignan.'

The object of Tracy's visit was to crush the Iroquois. For this purpose he had at his disposal a body of regular troops, the first which had been sent to Canada, veterans of the Fronde and Turkish wars, under the command of Colonel de Salières. The season was too far advanced for military operations. It was not till the following year that Tracy set out on his expedition, crossed Lake Champlain, threaded the Narrows, and landed where Fort William Henry was afterwards built. Between the French and the nearest Mohawk town lay 100 miles of rough marching. 600 regulars, 600 Canadians, and 100 friendly Indians as scouts, composed the force. All were full of enthusiasm. 'It seems to them,' wrote Mother Mary, 'that they are going to lay siege to Paradise, and win it, and enter in, because they are fighting for religion and the faith.' Without opposition they captured the five Mohawk towns, burnt the houses, destroyed the stores of corn and food; Te Deums were sung, masses said; the cross, and by its side the royal arms, were planted; the troops shouted 'Vive le roi!' and commenced their return. The expedition struck a heavy blow

at the power of the Iroquois; for twenty years peace endured without an open rupture. Tracy's work was done. With his glittering train he sailed for France, leaving to Courcelle and Talon the task of ruling and organising the colony.

At the moment of their triumph it is curious to mark the shadow of coming conflict thrown across the path of the French. Nicholls, governor of New York, tried hard to persuade the New-England colonists to combine and attack the French on their homeward march. If, he urged, Tracy's forces were destroyed, the conquest of Canada would be easy. New Amsterdam passed into the hands of England two years before Tracy's expedition. Mrs. Lamb's voluminous history of New York contains a very careful account of the transaction, and of the events by which it was preceded. Henry Hudson was employed in 1609 by the Dutch East India Company to discover a short passage to Asia. He reached Manhattan Island, and sailed up the river, which was called after him, as far as Albany. Boundary disputes at once arose between England and Holland.

'The Dutch statesmen claimed that they had discovered the Hudson River in 1609; that some of their people had returned there in 1610; that a specific trading charter had been granted in 1614; that a fort and garrison had been maintained there until the formation, in 1623, of the West India Company, which had since occupied the country; and great stress was laid on the purchase of the land from its aboriginal owners. The English based their claims upon the discovery of America by Cabot, and upon the patents granted by James I. They declared that the Indians were not *bonâ fide* possessors of the soil, and that, even if they were, they could not give a legal title unless all of them jointly contracted with the purchaser. They kindly offered to allow the Dutch to remain in New Netherland if they would submit themselves to the English Government; otherwise they would not be permitted "to encroach upon a colony of such importance as New England."' (*History of the City of New York*, pp. 64-5.)

In 1664, Charles and his ministers determined to seize New Netherland. Clarendon affixed the seal to a patent by which the king granted to the Duke of York the whole of the Dutch colony. James fitted out an expedition 'under the command of Colonel Robert Nicholls, the groom of his bedchamber, who was also commissioned as governor of the yet unpossessed territory.' The Dutch were wholly unprepared when the English fleet arrived. Stuyvesant, the governor, was compelled to surrender; and on September 6, 1664, signed the articles of capitulation. 'The Dutch citizens were guaranteed security in their property, customs, conscience, and religion. Intercourse with Holland

was to continue as before the coming of the English. 'Public buildings and public records were to be respected, and all civil officers were to remain in power until the customary time for a new election.' The only palliation for an act justly stigmatised as base lay in the neglect with which the States-General treated New Netherland. To Canada, as the action of Nicholls clearly foreshadowed, the event was of the utmost importance.

Under the administrative system established in 1665 Canada was governed for the next century. That system displays, as if it were a microscope, the characteristic defects of French absolutism. Its results were fatal to New France. As in the second period everything was staked on the success of missionary enterprise, so in the third the welfare of the colony wholly depended on the power of the mother country. During the first period of his reign Louis XIV. showed a paternal interest in the progress of New France. He built churches, aided convents and seminaries, supplemented the pay of curés, relieved the indigent, supported experimental industries, subsidised trade and agriculture. But as his European wars extended, his interest grew spasmodic, or with his increased expenditure his means of rendering assistance diminished.

Canada, like a French province, was reigned over by a governor and ruled by an intendant. A minute despotism regulated every detail of political and social life. In the hands of the governor, the intendant, and the superior council were concentrated all the powers of the State. De Courcelle was styled in his commission 'Gouverneur et Lieutenant-Général en Canada, Acadie, Isle de Terre-neuve, et autres pays de la France Septentrionale.' Distance from France gave a vigorous man, like Frontenac, a reality of power, of which provincial governors at home possessed only the shadow. In rank the governor was the first person in the colony. Military matters and foreign relations were his special province. The local governors of Montreal, Trois Rivières, and Quebec were his subordinates.

The commission of the intendant clothed him with enormous powers. He is styled 'Intendant de la Justice, Police, et Finance, en Canada, Acadie, Terre-neuve, et autres pays de la France Septentrionale.' To him was entrusted the whole administrative business of the colony. Generally a man of low birth and legal training, he was the king's agent, as the governor was the king's representative. He presided over the sessions of the council, took the votes,

pronounced its decisions. He possessed exclusive jurisdiction in all cases involving royal rights or conflicts between seigneur and vassal. He appointed inferior judges from whose decision he was the court of appeal. Controlling the whose expenditure of public money, he had an important voice in the special department of his colleague. He was required to be present at councils of war. He decided the amount and method of taxation, ordered and superintended all roads and public works, relieved the indigent, for beggars swarmed in Canada, instructed peasants in agriculture, and artisans in arts and manufacture, commanded or forbade methods and products of industry. He issued ordinances having the force of law; and his commission authorised him to 'order everything as he shall see just and proper.' A great number of these ordinances have been preserved.

'They were usually read to the people at the doors of churches after mass, or sometimes by the curé from his pulpit. They relate to a great variety of subjects—regulations of inns and markets, poaching, preservation of game, sale of brandy, rent of pews, stray hogs, mad dogs, tithes, matrimonial quarrels, fast driving, wards and guardians, weights and measures, nuisances, value of coinage, trespass on land, building churches, observance of Sunday, preservation of timber, seignior and vassal, settlement of boundaries, and many other matters.' (*Old Régime*, pp. 277–8.)

In the interests of agriculture, the intendant limited the people of Montreal to two horses, or mares, and one foal. To preserve the innocence of rural manners, country people were forbidden to live in Quebec under severe penalties, and citizens were fined if they let lodgings to rustics.

Two rival potentates like the governor and the intendant could not live in harmony. But friction was the object of a system which treated each official as a check upon the other, and both upon the bishop. In 1664 the council was appointed by the governor, the bishop, and the intendant; ultimately, to exclude the interference of the bishop, the king himself nominated the councillors. Members of the council were either farmers or traders, holding their posts for life, sometimes handing them on from father to son. No salary was attached to the office. It issued decrees for the civil, commercial, and financial government of the colony, sat as a court of appeal from subordinate courts, and, like the Parliament of Paris, registered edicts and ordinances. Its powers were purely formal.

'It is,' wrote the Intendant Meules, 'of very great importance that the people should not be left at liberty to

‘speak their own minds.’ Mr. Parkman quotes a curious illustration of the vigorous suppression of liberty of speech in the case of Paul Dupuy in 1671. Intellectual independence was discouraged. There was not a dissenter in the colony. Before the English occupation of Canada, the printing-press was unknown. The writer of a memorial on the state of the colony in 1736 states that ‘even the children of officers and gentlemen scarcely know how to read and write; they are ignorant of the first elements of geography and history.’ Every tendency to self-government was carefully suppressed. The inhabitants of a parish could not meet under the eye of the curé to estimate the cost of a new church without the license of the intendant. Canadian merchants were forbidden to assemble for the discussion of mercantile affairs. It was not till 1717 that a bourse was established at Quebec. The office of Syndic, to which the townsmen had elected, was abolished. A meeting of the principal inhabitants of Quebec was at first summoned by the superior council under the presidency of two of the councillors to discuss such questions as the price or quality of bread. But even this spark of representation was ruthlessly extinguished.

The first intendant, Talon, was a disciple of Colbert, and a man of remarkable energy and ability. Expansion abroad and protection at home was his policy. His efforts were directed towards the extension of French dominions and the development of colonial trade. His aim was

‘to occupy the interior of the continent, control the rivers which were its only highways, and hold it for France against every other nation. On the east, England was to be hemmed within a narrow strip of seaboard; while on the south Talon aimed at securing a port on the Gulf of Mexico, to keep the Spaniards in check, and dispute with them the possession of the vast regions which they claimed as their own. But the interior of the continent was still an unknown world. It behoved him to explore it; and to that end he availed himself of Jesuits, officers, fur-traders, and enterprising schemers like La Salle.’ (*La Salle and the Discovery of the Great West*, p. 38.)

At the same time he made every effort to develop trade. He constructed a dockyard, where he built two ships. He searched for minerals, and discovered both iron and copper. He established cod-fisheries, a tannery, a brewery, a factory of hats and shoes. He made tar, subsidised a soap manufactory, ordered farmers to grow hemp for cordage, supplied the Ursulines with flax and wool to teach the Canadians to weave and spin. He tried to open a road from Canada into

Acadia, and pushed exploring parties into the north and west. Anxious to create a trade with the West Indies, he freighted one of his home-built ships with Canadian produce, 'salted cod, salmon, eels, pease, fish-oil, staves, and planks,' and sent her thither to exchange her cargo for sugar.' Like Colbert he was an ardent Protectionist. Trade regulations were most minute; commerce with foreign countries and the English colonies was strictly prohibited; the profits of French merchants were fixed by elaborate tariffs. But nothing was done by private enterprise, no commercial undertaking was launched without State aid; even the fisheries and timber-mills were partly supported by royal bounty. Of all his costly experiments none succeeded. No trade flourished except that in beaver-skins.

Meanwhile, Louis XIV. spared no expense to people Canada. In two years he spent 200,000 livres, and sent out 300 emigrants, who were collected in troops by the royal agents, marched in squads to Dieppe or Rochelle, and thence embarked to Canada. The officers and men of the regiment of Carignan were encouraged by rewards and grants of land to settle in the country. The population rose from 2,500 in 1660 to 5,870 in 1668. Women from the poor-houses of Paris and Lyons, peasant girls from country districts, and even consignments of young ladies, were sent out as wives for the colonists. The young women were shipped to Quebec under the care of a matron appointed by the king. At Montreal and at Quebec a matrimonial bazaar was opened. Mr. Parkman quotes a letter of La Hontan:—

'These vestals were, so to speak, piled one on the other in three different halls, where the bridegrooms chose their brides as a butcher chooses his sheep out of the midst of the flock. There was wherewith to content the most fantastical in these three harems; for here were to be seen the tall and the short, the blond and the brown, the plump and the lean; everybody, in short, found a shoe to fit him. At the end of a fortnight not one was left. I am told that the plumpest were taken first, because it was thought that, being less active, they were more likely to keep at home, and that they could resist the cold better.' (*Old Régime*, pp. 220-1).

The girls were married by thirties at a time. With each bride the king bestowed a dowry. Special gifts were given to men who married young. Bounties of 1,200 livres were bestowed on those who had fifteen children, and smaller sums in proportion. Fathers were fined who did not marry their children before a certain age. Bachelors bore additional

burdens of taxation; they were excluded from all honours, forbidden to hunt, fish, trade with the Indians, or go into the woods on any pretext whatever.

Feudalism afforded a convenient agency for the distribution of land; it was also well adapted for military exigencies. Large tracts were granted among the officers of the regiment of Carignan, who distributed portions to the soldiers, and so formed a line of military cantonments on the banks of the Richelieu. Mr. Parkman notes that many of the towns and villages owe their names to these officers, such as Sorel, Chambly, St. Ours, Contrecoeur, Varennes, Verchères. Royal edicts were powerless to force the colonists to concentrate. Gradually the côtes or clearings extended along the St. Lawrence for ninety miles below Quebec to thirty miles above Montreal. Feudal tenure was the basis of the Canadian land-settlement. But with Richelieu's work fresh in his memory and his own despotic inclinations, Louis XIV. allowed no rival jurisdiction to clash with his absolute authority. Single fiefs, often of large size, were granted. But the terms on which subinfeudation was permitted were closely supervised. The militia of the colony was called out by the governor; he commanded it and appointed its officers. The judicial powers of the seigneurs were generally restricted to petty disputes. Only in three or four instances was jurisdiction granted over heinous offences. Even here an appeal lay to the intendant. Over its grants of land the Crown retained control. Mines and minerals, oaks for the navy, and the right to take land for forts or roadways were reserved. At any moment a decree of the king, edict of the Council, or ordinance of the intendant might change old conditions, impose new terms, interfere between the seigneur and his vassal. All land was granted on the condition that it should be cleared within a certain period. No uncleared land could be sold by the grantor; hence he was compelled to let it out upon small, often nominal rent to the 'censitaire.' So long as the rent was paid, the title of the 'censitaire' or 'habitant' was indefeasible. Many vexatious obligations of feudal tenure were preserved. The 'habitant' was obliged to labour for his lord on certain days, to grind his corn at the lord's mill, to bake at the lord's bakehouse. No land could be bought or sold without heavy fines of alienation. It was in these matters that the intendant interfered on behalf of the 'habitant.' It is strange to hear Talon use the fatal language of later days. The relations of lord and vassal ought,

he says, to be 'brought down to the level of the first grants 'made in the days of innocence.'

The creation of a Canadian noblesse exercised an important influence on the colony. In 1664 there were but four noble families, three of which were only saved from starvation by royal bounties. Canada was not the country for idlers. Unused to manual labour, the noble could not trade without forfeiture of rank. But except as a farmer, shop-keeper, or official, he could not gain a livelihood. At Talon's request the king conferred on the most prominent colonists patents of nobility. The precedent was mischievous. All Canada aspired to be ennobled. Those whose ambition was gratified lived the lives of country gentlemen, so long as they could borrow money; their wives played the fine lady; their sons ranged the woods as 'coureurs de bois.' The Governor Denonville entreated the king not to grant more patents, unless he wished to multiply beggars and outlaws. Royal alms were prodigally bestowed on the starving nobles, and they were permitted to trade even in retail without loss of rank. But there still remained a crowd of needy youths who became 'coureurs de bois,' those roving fur-traders whom Washington Irving has described in 'Astoria.' The fur trade was both adventurous and profitable. The 'coureurs 'de bois' dealt with the Indian hunter on his own grounds, roaming for hundreds of miles through the western wilderness, 'sometimes proscribed by the government, sometimes 'leagued in contraband traffic with its highest officials, a 'hardy vedette of civilisation, tracing unknown streams, 'piercing unknown forests, trading, fighting, negotiating, 'and building forts.' For months together they disappeared from the colony. Their return to Montreal, as La Hontan describes it, resembled the return of a crew of pirates. Every house was turned into a tavern: day and night were spent in singing, gambling, and drinking. When their money was gone, they sold their finery, confessed to the priest, received absolution, and took again to the woods, to make the Indian villages 'taverns for drunkenness, and 'Sodom's for iniquity.' These were the men, as Mr. Parkman says, 'who discovered the Ohio, explored the Mississippi 'to its mouth, and founded Detroit, St. Louis, and New 'Orleans.' They became intelligent beasts of prey, uniting to the perseverance and foresight and power of combination of the whites the cunning and ferocity of the Red Indians. They led wild forays among outlying farms and hamlets of New England, appearing and disappearing with the swift-

ness and secrecy of their savage allies, whom they rivalled in pitiless cruelty.

The administrative system adopted in Canada was based on 'monopoly in trade, monopoly in religion, monopoly in 'government.' The colony, never weaned from the mother country, was kept in a state of political infancy and tutelary subjection. The people were held in leading-strings, forbidden to learn lessons of self-reliance. Centralisation destroyed local, provincial, or municipal freedom. Not only did it absorb in itself all legislative, judicial, and legislative functions, but it deprived the colonists of self-government, of liberty of speech, of thought, and of the pen. It led Canada by the hand, tutored every movement, assisted every action, fettered every limb. It imposed restrictions which stunted industry, starved commerce, wasted natural wealth. It regulated the whole business of the commonwealth, and penetrated into the remotest corners of social life. Leaving no field for united action, withholding the incentive of common aims, it fostered dissociation. In such an atmosphere even patriotism pined. Already the colony, however superior to that of New England in the externals of civilisation, bore signs of deadly disease. Bold, energetic, adventurous spirits, whose vigour might have been diverted into useful channels, found their career in an illicit trade which drained the life-blood of the colony. Lawlessness was the only garb of freedom.

Canada stood or fell by the power of France. And that power, at the close of the seventeenth century, was already on the wane. The despotism of Louis XIV. stifled individual greatness; all the great men of his reign had attained their intellectual vigour in the atmosphere of license, 'le tems de 'la bonne Régence, tems où régnait une heureuse abondance,' of which St. Evremond speaks with regretful tenderness. Louis XIV. could not fill their place. Unrivalled in the art of simulating greatness, he made his person and his government appear august; yet both fell short of the ordinary standard. His colonial policy failed. Had he allowed the Protestants to colonise the country, Canada might have flourished. But the Jesuits and Madame de Maintenon were resolved that, at all hazards, New France should remain Catholic. The opportunity was missed both by Louis and his successor. Thousands of the most intelligent and self-reliant men in France carried their arts and industries to foreign countries. Louis XIV. left behind him a beaten army, an empty treasury, a starving people. All

the resources of the State were exhausted to defray that lavish expenditure which is the almsgiving of kings. The same process of impoverishment continued under Louis XV., who made the monarchy not only pernicious but contemptible. Society was hopelessly vicious. The court was orthodox in persecution, punctilious in formalities, unblushingly profligate in practice. Religion disappeared like the fashion which Madame Maintenon boasted she had made it. Power passed from the hands of one vizier and sultana to another, till under Du Barri and Maupeou the nation sighed for Pompadour and Choiseul. When the final struggle for the New World came, Canada was still dependent on the mother country, but the home government was rotten to the core.

Besides the fur trade, the only outlet for individual energy or private enterprise was exploration. Rumours of a mighty stream, rising in the north and flowing southwards, from time to time reached the colonies. Explorers believed that this river might open out a western passage to China and Japan. It was the revival of the dream which had stimulated the explorations of Champlain. Fur-traders, who had wintered on Lake Superior, brought back strange reports of the Sioux and their great river 'Mesipi.' From the Indians who visited their remote missions on the Upper Lakes, Ste. Marie du Saut on the outlet of Lake Superior, or St. Esprit on its western extremity, or St. François Xavier at the head of the Green Bay of Lake Michigan, the Jesuits heard the same rumours. Here was a vast continent which might be conquered for their Order. Jacques Marquette, a Jesuit priest, and Joliet, an enterprising fur-trader, who had been educated for the priesthood at the Jesuit College of Quebec, and was employed by Talon in exploration, were the first Frenchmen who discovered the Mississippi. The previous discoveries of De Soto and his Spanish followers had long been forgotten. Launching their canoes on the Wisconsin in June, 1673, they 'committed themselves to the current ' which was to bear them they knew not whither—perhaps ' to the Gulf of Mexico, perhaps to the South Sea, or the ' Gulf of California.' On June 17, they found what they sought, and 'with a joy,' writes Marquette, 'which I cannot ' express,' steered their canoes into the great stream of the Mississippi. They passed the mouths of the Missouri and the Ohio, and penetrated some distance below the Arkansas. Then, satisfied that the river discharged its waters into the Gulf of Mexico, they returned. It was in the interests of religion that Marquette's voyage had been made. His last

act was to found his mission of the Immaculate Conception among the Illinois.

‘We turn,’ writes Mr. Parkman, ‘from the humble Marquette, thanking God with his last breath that he died for his Order and his Faith; and by our side stands the masculine form of Cavalier de la Salle. Prodigious was the contrast between the two discoverers; the one, with clasped hands and upturned eyes, seems a figure evoked from some dim legend of mediæval saintship; the other, with feet firm-planted on the hard earth, breathes the self-relying energies of modern practical enterprise. Nevertheless La Salle’s enemies called him a visionary. His projects perplexed and startled them. At first they ridiculed him; and then, as step by step he advanced towards his purpose, they denounced and maligned him. What was this purpose? It was not of sudden growth, but developed as years went on. La Salle at La Chine dreamed of a western passage to China, and nursed vague schemes of western discovery. Then, when his earlier journeyings revealed to him the valley of the Ohio and the fertile plains of Illinois, his ambition found a new field. La Salle became convinced that the Mississippi flowed not into the Pacific or the Gulf of California, but into the Gulf of Mexico. By a fortified post at its mouth, he could guard it against both English and Spaniards, and secure for the trade of the interior an access and an outlet under his own control, and open at every season.’—(*La Salle*, pp. 73–4.)

The different characters and aims of Marquette and of La Salle sum up the points of contrast between the second and third periods of Canadian history.

Mr. Parkman has himself visited the scenes of La Salle’s adventurous wanderings. From the first arrival of his hero in Canada to his assassination in Louisiana, he tells the tale of his exploits with the kindred zest of a traveller. The difficulties which La Salle overcame fire the enthusiasm of an historian who, in a different field, has shown something of the same resolution. La Salle had already explored the Ohio and the Illinois, when, in 1673, he unfolded his project to Frontenac. That vigorous governor gave him his warmest support. Two years later Louis XIV. granted to La Salle a patent to explore the west, secure the country by building forts, and, if possible, reach the Gulf of Mexico. At the eastern end of Lake Ontario, Fort Frontenac was erected, by the governor himself, to be the basis of La Salle’s expedition. His first design was to build a ship, and sail down the Mississippi into the Gulf of Mexico, collecting furs on the way to defray the cost of the voyage. But from the first he was unfortunate. His vessel, the ‘Griffin,’ so called after the armorial bearings of Frontenac, was wrecked, as La Salle believed, by the treachery of the pilot. Several

times his canoes were swamped, with his guns, baggage, and provisions. He was plundered by his agents, robbed by his servants, pestered by his creditors, who seized his stores. La Barre, Frontenac's successor, was hostile to him, and destroyed Fort Frontenac, with all its contents. He was surrounded by secret as well as open foes, for the Jesuits intrigued against him not only with his followers, but with the Indians. From the outset, the Jesuits opposed his enterprise and stirred up the native tribes to bar his progress. He patronised the Franciscans, and was supported by Frontenac, whom they hated; he was their chief rival in the valley of the Mississippi. The dislike was mutual, for La Salle boasted that he would 'make the "Griffin" fly above the crows.' Discontent and mutiny were rife among his followers; they deserted on every opportunity; twice they attempted to poison him. He left behind him garrisons and stores at Fort St. Joseph on Lake Michigan, and at Fort Crèvecœur on the Illinois, the first civilised occupation of the region which is now the State of Illinois; but his men destroyed the forts, and took to the woods. His fort of St. Louis among the Illinois and Miamis was burnt during an invasion of the Iroquois. He was more than once struck down by illness; he suffered from snow-blindness and from hernia. He had but one faithful and reliable friend, the Italian Tonty. Added to his difficulties, disappointments, and failures, were the hardships of his voyage. If the way led through a forest, La Salle went first, hatchet in hand, to clear the road. If they journeyed through snow-drifts or half-frozen swamps, he walked before his men to encourage them by breaking a path. But his iron resolution never yielded. In April, 1682, he neared the goal of his expedition. On the 6th, 'the river divided itself into three broad channels. La Salle took that of the west, and D'Autr'ay that of the east, while Tonty took the middle. As he drifted down the turbid current, between the low and marshy shores, the brackish water changed to brine, and the breeze grew fresh with the salt breath of the sea.' La Salle had reached the Gulf of Mexico. 'A column was made ready, bearing the arms of France and inscribed with the words "Louis le Grand, Roy de France et de Navarre, règne; le neuvième Avril, 1682."' La Salle planted the column in its place, and, in the name of Louis, took possession of Louisiana, from the source of the Mississippi to its mouth, and of all the country watered by its tributaries. The new dominion was not merely the modern State of

Louisiana; but it stretched from the Alleghanies to the Rocky Mountains, from the Rio Grande on the Gulf of Mexico to the head springs of the Missouri.

Three years later La Salle sailed from France for the Gulf of Mexico to establish a colony on the Mississippi. But he failed to find the mouth of the river. The short-lived settlement of St. Louis in Texas was the only result of an expedition which ended in his assassination. But France had now entered on that scheme of seizing all the lines of communication between the St. Lawrence and the Mississippi, which promised to give her the ascendancy in North America, and to confine the British colonies to their narrow seaboard. The policy which Talon and Frontenac initiated was steadily pursued during the eighteenth century. In 1699, D'Iberville, more fortunate than La Salle, reached the mouth of the Mississippi, and at Biloxi planted the first European settlement in what is now the State of Mississippi. In 1718 New Orleans was founded by Law's notorious company. The French advanced their lines to the north and south. With their colony on the Mobile Bay they drove back the boundary of Spanish Florida to the left bank of the Alabama; they pushed their way up the Red River towards the borders of Mexico. By the subjugation of the native tribes they gained command of the left bank of the Mississippi to its junction with the Ohio, above the point where La Salle had erected Fort Prudhomme. Meanwhile France barred the weak spot in the defensive position of Canada, the highway of Lake Champlain, with Fort Frederic, called Crown Point by the English, and Fort St. Louis. Her savage allies watched the southern borders of her settlements on the St. Lawrence. She held the inland oceans of the west with Niagara and Detroit, and forts on Lakes Michigan and Superior. By means of Fort Presquile, where Erie now stands, Fort le Bœuf at the head of the Alleghany, and Fort Duquesne on the fork of the Ohio, she was mistress of the valley of the 'Beautiful River.' Her design of linking Canada to Louisiana by a chain of forts from the Gulf of the St. Lawrence to the Gulf of Mexico had been imperfectly executed. But the thriving Jesuit mission of Kaskaskia, Fort Chartres, and two or three smaller settlements were established on the upper waters of the Mississippi.

In 1754 England had no settlement west of the Alleghany. Such was the result of French policy in North America in its most developed form. From the moment that La Salle's great scheme assumed definite shape, a struggle with the

British colonies was not only inevitable but imminent. It was impossible that with their rapidly growing population they should acquiesce in their isolation between the sea and the Alleghany mountains. Their charters expressly or impliedly contemplated their expansion towards the west, and from sea to sea. The contest began seventy years before 1754, when 'the volley from the hunting-pieces of a few ' backwoodsmen, commanded by a Virginian youth, George ' Washington, set Europe in a blaze.' In 1651 the two rivals for the possession of North America first came into contact. In that year the Jesuit Druilletes was sent to Boston to offer New England free trade with France in return for assistance against the Iroquois. Fortunately for the interests of the British colonies, the offer was refused. The Iroquois were destined to prove most useful checks on the territorial aggrandisement of France; they alone preserved the frontiers of New York from Canadian encroachment. No serious collision between England and France in North America occurred till 1689. But the extension of the French power towards the west, and the gradual exclusion of the English from the profitable fur trade, had previously excited the alarm of Dongan, the Governor of New York. France and England were then at peace, and Dongan's master, James II., was drawn to Louis XIV. by the tie of religion. Dongan's only hope of checking the French advance lay in intrigue with the Iroquois. Even before Frontenac's recall in 1682 their attitude was threatening. The lesson inflicted upon them by Tracy had been forgotten; they had conquered their native rivals; they were well supplied with arms and ammunition by the Dutch and English. They boasted of their intention, as Frontenac wrote to the king, to 'pounce ' on Canada, and overwhelm it in a single campaign.' The conduct of Frontenac's successors accelerated the threatened invasion. Denonville's treachery and fruitless expedition rather enraged than crippled their power. He disturbed a wasps' nest and left the wasps alive. At this time the Iroquois kept the balance of North America, and knew their importance. Courted and caressed by both England and France, they had no difficulty in preserving their independence. They held their land of the Great Spirit alone. So advantageous a position was not lightly to be surrendered. But for Denonville's folly, they might have remained quiet. His attack upon the Senecas, and English intrigues, set the whole confederacy in motion. In August 1689 the cloud of invasion, which had long threatened the Canadian frontier,

burst upon the colony. Under cover of a terrific storm, the Iroquois landed above Montreal, and commenced the most frightful massacre of the neighbouring settlers which Canadian history had ever known. Montreal itself

‘was wild with terror. It had been fortified with palisades since the war began; but, though there were troops in the town under the command of the Governor himself, the people were in mortal dread. . . . The Iroquois held undisputed possession of the open country, burned all the houses and barns over an extent of nine miles, and roamed, pillaging and scalping, over more than twenty miles. Charlevoix says that the invaders remained in the neighbourhood of Montreal till the middle of October, or more than two months. . . . At length most of them took to their canoes, and recrossed Lake St. Louis in a body, giving ninety yells to show that they had ninety prisoners in their clutches. This was not all; for the whole number carried off was more than a hundred and twenty, besides about two hundred who had the good fortune to be killed on the spot. . . . Towards evening, they encamped on the farther side of the lake, and began to torture and devour their prisoners. On that miserable night, stupefied and speechless groups stood gazing from the strand of La Chine at the lights that gleamed along the distant shore of Chateaugay, where their friends, wives, parents, or children agonised in the fires of the Iroquois, and scenes were enacted of indescribable and nameless horror.’ —(*Frontenac and New France*, pp. 180–1.)

The news of William’s accession to the English throne put the finishing touch to the misfortunes of the French. Canada, crushed by the invasion of the Red Indians, would have to face the Iroquois openly supported by the British colonies.

In these desperate circumstances Frontenac, now seventy years of age, was again sent out to Canada. Before the peace of Ryswick was signed he had crushed the Iroquois, beaten off Phips and the Boston fleet, repulsed the two attacks of New York, and, with ferocious bands of Christian Indians led by ‘coureurs de bois’ and priests, had destroyed the farms and butchered the inhabitants along the whole frontier of New England. He died in 1698.

‘What may be least forgiven him,’ says Mr. Parkman, ‘is the barbarity of the warfare that he waged, and the cruelties that he permitted. . . . Yet he was no whit more ruthless than his times and surroundings, and some of his contemporaries find fault with him for not allowing more Indian captives to be tortured. Many surpassed him in cruelty, none equalled him in capacity and vigour. When civilised enemies were once within his power, he treated them according to their degree with a chivalrous courtesy or a generous kindness. If he was a hot and pertinacious foe, he was also a fast friend; and he excited love and hatred in about equal measure. His attitude towards

public enemies was always proud and peremptory, yet his courage was guided by so clear a sagacity that he never was forced to recede from the position he had taken. Towards Indians, he was an admirable compound of sternness and conciliation. Of the immensity of his services to the colony there can be no doubt. He found it, under Denonville, in humiliation and terror; and he left it in honour and almost in triumph. A more remarkable figure, in its bold and salient individuality and sharply marked light and shadow, is nowhere seen in American history.'—(*Frontenac and New France*, pp. 435-6.)

It was under the rule of Frontenac that the first open collision occurred between the French and English in North America. His policy, carried on by his successors, made the conflict thus commenced continuous; the war, though nominally interrupted by the peaces of Ryswick, Utrecht, and Aix-la-Chapelle, continued with little intermission till the commencement of the final struggle which Mr. Parkman narrates in 'Montcalm and Wolfe.' As has already been said, the events of that war lie outside the range of the present article. But the course adopted has this disadvantage. Mr. Parkman's last two volumes are perhaps the most valuable, they are certainly the most finished, of his interesting series. The portraits, such as those of Wolfe, Braddock, and Johnson, are effectively drawn: that of Montcalm, mainly gathered from previously unpublished sources, is not only attractive, but strikingly fresh. Montcalm's bravery as a soldier and ability as a commander, the simple piety, southern vivacity, and feminine tenderness of his nature which breathe in the letters to his wife and mother, are skilfully blended into a picture, over which is thrown the pathos of his exile from the plantations and chestnut groves, the oil-mill and mulberry trees of his chateau of Candiac, and of his death within the walls of Quebec before the surrender of the city. The battle-pieces are spirited. Seldom of late years has the romance of war been painted with more effect than in the rout of Braddock or the victory of Wolfe on the Plains of Abraham. The style is less ambitious and more subdued. Without sacrifice of picturesqueness, there is less of that garish colouring which disfigures the earlier landscapes.

The fatal influence of the administrative system of the *ancien régime* upon colonial character has been already stated. Political and religious tutelage produced a chronic debility. Not only defects of government, but social vices, were transplanted from the Old World to the New. In external aspect Canadian society was singularly picturesque,

with 'its military governor holding his miniature court on 'the rock of Quebec; the feudal proprietors, whose domains 'lined the shores of the St. Lawrence; the peasant; the 'roving bushranger; the half-tamed savage with crucifix and 'scalping knife; priests, friars, nuns, and soldiers.' Montreal, which had become the social capital, was, as Mr. Parkman elsewhere says, 'a sparkling fragment of the reign of 'Louis XV. dropped into the American wilderness.' In its balls, supper parties, masquerades, and gambling, it emulated the gaiety and gallantry of Versailles. While the peasantry were ignorant and abjectly superstitious, the higher classes exhibited that flippant scepticism, with its attendant vices of immorality and corruption, which characterised society during the decadence of the French monarchy. Men found it so easy to perform the grimace of piety that they ended by believing piety to be only a grimace. Their morality was undermined by their hypocrisy. If there was no 'Parc aux Cerfs' at Quebec, the Intendant Bigot imitated the part of Louis XV. at the Hermitage on the banks of the St. Charles. Men of high position were bribed with money or professional advancement to connive at the dishonour of their wives. Canada, robbed of every vestige of civil liberty, was ruled by servants whose master was beyond the Atlantic. The result was inevitable. Government officials formed a ring for fraud, jobbery, and peculation, of which Bigot was the centre. The officers of the militia and colonial regulars shared the corruption of the civil service. There were but four Canadian officers who escaped the contagion; 'not 'enough,' observes Bougainville, 'to save Sodom.' 'This is 'a land,' exclaims the author of '*Considérations sur l'État présent du Canada*,' 'of abuses, ignorance, prejudice, and all 'that is monstrous in government. Peculation, monopoly, 'and plunder have become a bottomless abyss.' Montcalm condemned Canada as a country in which 'all the knaves 'grow rich and the honest men are ruined.' Among the moral causes of the downfall of the French in Canada, no slight weight must be attributed to the rottenness of her society.

Mere numerical preponderance will not adequately explain the victory of the British. It is true that in the middle of the eighteenth century the British colonists 'numbered in 'all, from Georgia to Maine, about eleven hundred and sixty 'thousand white inhabitants. By the census of 1754 Canada 'had but fifty-five thousand.' Another twenty-five thousand must be added as the population of Acadia and Louisiana.

Religious monopoly checked the natural growth of the French colonial population. No inducement to emigrate existed for the Catholics, the favoured class in France; yet none but Catholics were permitted to settle. Like the French people generally, the colonists multiplied slowly; the best men were under vows of perpetual chastity; the increase of population was opposed to the interests of the fur-traders. But mere disparity of numbers was almost counter-balanced by the advantages which New France possessed. She had at her disposal hordes of savage allies skilled in backwoods warfare. She occupied a position of immense natural strength. Her enemies were a string of discordant communities, hampered by refractory assemblies, divided by internal dissensions, differing so widely in character and disposition that they displayed more points of antagonism than of resemblance. Canada, united and centralised, could move her forces with that vigour, decision, and celerity which despotism alone commands. Had the Canadians received the same training as the New-England colonists, they would not have succumbed to the forces by which they were opposed. It is to the religious and political system established in Canada that the French inferiority in numbers as well as their ultimate defeat must be attributed.

New France was founded under the patronage of a court, New England without its favour; the one was colonised by a government, the other by a people; the former by single men and single women, the latter by families. English colonists were driven to emigrate by poverty or persecution; their settlement was, in its origin, a protest for religious and political liberty. No such causes peopled Canada. The Canadians were neither religious refugees nor the overflow of the older community; the bulk of them were landed in New France by the arbitrary will of Louis XIV. Such colonists mustered few settlers of the same stamp as those who faced exile sooner than be poor or persecuted at home. But this early taint of disease might have yielded to the rough treatment of colonial life. The French settlers under Champlain won a precarious foothold on the banks of the St. Lawrence. Like the New-England colonists, the early Canadians maintained an incessant struggle for existence; like them they underwent a training eminently calculated to develop self-reliance and independence. But, at every step in their subsequent history, Canada and New England diverged more widely apart. Each of the three periods that have been marked in Canadian history contributed its ele-

ments of weakness. Champlain left as a legacy to his successors the alliance with the Hurons and the hostility of the Iroquois. It is a distinctive feature of the French occupation of Canada that they endeavoured not to exterminate, enslave, or even displace, but to amalgamate with the native tribes. The policy which Champlain began for purposes of exploration, missionaries continued in the interests of Christianity, and fur-traders perpetuated for the sake of commerce. Forty years of missionary enterprise were wasted, so far as the growth of Canada was concerned, in the unsuccessful labour of christianising the Red Indians. On this movement and period were concentrated the energy and enthusiasm of the colony. Before experience proved the hopelessness of the task, the opportunity of crushing the Iroquois had passed away. Possessed of the arms of civilised soldiers, the Five Nations overpowered the Canadians. It is difficult to exaggerate the disastrous effect on the colony of their inveterate hostility. With the second period was created the religious monopoly. Before 1628 Canada was open to both Catholics and Huguenots; subsequently she was 'a citadel of Roman Catholic orthodoxy.' In the British colonies, taken together, every phase of religious thought was represented. Canada adopted the rule of exclusion; her rivals built on the principle of comprehension. Thus France resolutely rejected religion, the strongest and most enduring of all agents of colonisation. Nor was this all. Intellectual dependence characterises priest-ridden countries. Popular education, discouraged in Canada, was widely diffused in New England; while Canada possessed no printing-press, New England boasted a respectable native literature. Religious despotism checked population, repressed moral courage, enervated mental robustness. The third period brought with it, or exaggerated, monopolies of trade and government. Both France and England regarded their American settlements as farms, regulated colonial trade in their own interests, monopolised their consumption, and carried their produce. But while the British colonists developed their own industries, nothing in Canada was left to private enterprise. Nor did Canada devote herself to agriculture, the nursing mother of nations. Perseverance is pre-eminently the quality of the French peasant; but, off his own soil, he displays no capacity for continuous exertion. Minute and vexatious regulations imposed by the Canadian Government increased his repugnance to agriculture. Traffic in the natural productions of the country, not the cultivation of

the soil, was from first to last the absorbing interest of the colonists. Adventure, freedom, high profits, combined to render the fur trade intensely attractive. But this fatal trade, which checked the growth of population, diverted the settlers from fixed pursuits, and drained the life-blood of the colony, received from the Government itself its most powerful incentive. France transplanted from the Old World her institutions, her Catholic Church, her feudal society, and bureaucratic centralisation. She imposed them with a strong hand on Canada from without. Self-government was rigorously suppressed. The colonists, excluded from public life, had only private interests; in the fur trade they found their one field of energy; the sole education afforded by the political system was not in independence, but in insubordination; liberty was unknown except as license. New England, on the contrary, was created by, and in turn created, self-reliant, self-dependent men; centralisation was not only alien, but unknown; her constitutions were native products, growing with the growth of the people; her popular institutions offered ample field for the development of public life and energy. Patronage was the portion of Canada, neglect the more fortunate lot of New England; the one remained a timid dependency, the other became a sturdy colony, jealous of her independence; the one proved a skilfully arranged failure, the other a blundering success. Inexperienced in self-exertion, untrained in self-reliance, socially and politically diseased, Canada was powerless to walk alone. She stood or fell by the mother country. And France, enfeebled by the same disease which had stunted the growth of her colony, was but the shadow of her former self. Entangled in a great European war, she could render no permanent resistance. Such were the causes which 'ended the 'chequered story of New France,' 'a story which would have 'been a history if faults of constitution and the bigotry and 'folly of rulers had not dwarfed it to an episode.'

- ART. V.—1. *Harbours and Docks: their Physical Features, History, Construction, Equipment, and Maintenance.* By L. F. VERNON HARCOURT, M. Inst. C.E. Two vols. 8vo; Text and Illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1885.
2. *The Design and Construction of Harbours: a Treatise on Maritime Engineering.* By THOMAS STEVENSON, F.R.S.E., M. Inst. C.E. Third Edition. Edinburgh: 1885.
3. *Reports from the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation.* Ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, July 13, 1883, and July 22, 1884.

OCEAN harbours must always prove an attractive subject to an insular people. Unless we are prepared to hold the old Greek view of autochthonic populations, it is to the harbours on our coasts that we must look for the cradles of our race. In the early times of the sea kings, indeed, when the small stout craft that could beat through the storms of the northern seas bore their marauding adventurers to every shore, the Saxon and the Dane could readily find points on which to beach their invading vessels. From Hengistbury Head, the name of which indicates the date of its capture by the Saxon chief who entrenched it, to the shores of Fife, which ‘saw the Norwegian banners flout the sky,’ the coasts of Britain have afforded an unwilling hospitality to countless sea robbers. The eagle-bearer of Cæsar leapt into the shallow water on the shelving shore of Deal; William the Conqueror landed in Pevensey Bay; ‘Harry of Hereford, Lancaster, and ‘Derby’ disembarked from ‘eight tall ships, three thousand ‘men of war,’ under the shelter of the ever shifting point of Ravenspurgh; where also Edward IV. landed on his return from Flanders; Henry of Richmond landed, also with three thousand men, at Milford; William of Orange landed at Torbay. Thus the union of the Roses and the close of our civil wars are associated with our noblest harbour; while the House of Brunswick owes to the shelter of the Thames the reception of its founder at Greenwich. Of less successful descents, after we pass the semi-mythical times of the Confessor, that of the Dauphin, in the reign of King John, took place at Sandwich. Monmouth landed at Lyme Regis. Prince Charles Edward, in the year of the battle of Culloden, landed at Borodale, in Lochaber; and a French expedition, which disembarked in Fishguard Bay in one of the closing years of the eighteenth century, laid down its arms before the tall

hats and scarlet cloaks of the comely women of Pembroke-shire, whom they mistook for the royal troops.

Those to whom the physical features of England, as regarded from the summits of its highest mountains, are familiar, can best appreciate the vivid reality with which the poet of the 'Armada' has pictured the leap of the war flame from hill to hill. If the mantle of Macaulay had fallen on a poet possessed of as familiar an acquaintance with the bluffs and promontories of the coast 'from Eddystone to Berwick' bounds, from Lynn to Milford Bay,' as does a veteran harbour builder whom we are about to quote, we might have hoped for a stirring pendant to that most noble fragment of English verse.

But while the physical or orographical features of a sea coast form the first elements in the disposition of its harbours, the relation of such maritime centres to national life has, as a rule, been determined rather by the geological character of the soil than by more readily visible facts. Amid the dense populations which are now doubling themselves in eighty, sixty, or forty years, we are too apt to overlook the simple conditions which originally determine the founding of cities and of ports. Of these water supply is the first; and ancient names and long-descended villages and hamlets will often be found to dot the outcrop of some impervious bed of clay which throws out a series of springs along the scarp of a hill. Great rivers, above tidal influence, afford an unfailing and admirable supply of potable water, or, at all events, did so in those days when the wanton pollution of a stream was held to bring down the vengeance of the unseen powers of nature. Thus the spot where a great tidal river becomes fordable, or readily to be crossed by a ferry or a bridge, is likely to become, as in the case of London, the nucleus of a great port; and when the valley thus watered is sheltered and fertile, as is that of the Thames, population is tempted to settle in such a locality. With regard to the origin of London as a city and a port, it must also be remembered that the Thames is the true prolongation of the Kennet, which waters the ancient religious capital of the country in long prehistoric times, megalithic, mound-circled Avebury. Thus other reasons besides the existence of the safe and accessible harbour formed by the lower course of the Thames, have combined to stimulate the growth and to expand the commerce of London.

On the opposite coast of this island lies a harbour, unrivalled in the world for the combination of large area, perfect

shelter, ready entrance and 'loosing' in all winds, and accessibility from all the ports of the world. But almost directly after leaving the old red sandstone, on which the little town of Milford stands, arises a long reach of swelling undulations of that barren and sun-dried clay which Pembroke-shire calls 'rab,' and Cornwall 'killis.' The climate is damp. The coal, although peeping out on the face of the cliffs, is of an inferior quality, non-bituminous, and chiefly won as culm or coal dust, which is made into balls by the admixture of clay for domestic fuel. Slate is obtainable near, but not, as far as yet worked, of equal quality to that in North Wales. The more valuable metals have not been found in the vicinity of Milford Harbour. There has been little but the excellence of the Haven itself to tempt the commerce for which it offers so ample an area; and even after its linking to London by the opening of the South Wales Railway, poverty, sparse population, and long land distance, have hitherto prevented the first of our English ports from asserting its native rank.

No good account exists of the ports and harbours of the United Kingdom. A vast quantity of material has been collected by the Tidal Harbour Commission, in 1845 and 1849, in the shape of plans of harbours, but the recommendation that the detailed information should be brought together and arranged in a central office has met with no attention. The plans are often on different scales, and the want of system in which some of our public offices delight has full exemplification in the case of our harbours. It is on evidence before the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation of 1883, that, since the transference to the Board of Trade of the duties which the Admiralty formerly performed with regard to harbours, they have been comparatively neglected; nor is the Board so constituted as properly to provide for the examination of details connected with the improvement of harbours. Notwithstanding our insular condition, we have been as little careful to obtain systematic information about our ports and harbours as about our domestic water supply and river outfall.

A Parliamentary return of the names and addresses of port and harbour authorities, dated June 11, 1874 (No. 213, 1874), gives the nearest approach, until quite recently made, to an index of this important element of national defence and of national wealth. As in most Parliamentary returns sought for the purposes of engineering information, there occur numerous gaps and blanks in this; and out of 588 ports

enumerated, there are no fewer than 246 of which the proprietorship does not appear to be definitely brought before Parliament. In the first place have to be enumerated the war ports—Devonport, Milford Haven, Plymouth, Portland, Portsmouth, St. David's, and Solva—which are under the direct authority of the Admiralty. Three commercial ports—Dover, Holyhead, and Ramsgate—have been constructed by the Government, and are under the authority of the Board of Trade. The Commissioners of Woods and Forests control the port of Holy Island; and the Irish Board of Public Works administers those of Annalong, Carlingford, Donaghadee, Dunmore, Howth, Kilkels, Kingstown, and Newcastle. Of the remainder, forty-seven are owned by railway companies, twenty-five by other companies, fifty-three by private individuals, and commissioners or local boards have the control of the residue.

A list of piers and harbours round the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland, prepared by the Chairman of the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation, will be found in the appendix to the Report of 1884. It enumerates 541 places in Great Britain, 178 in Ireland, and 131 on Skye and other Western Isles, in all 850, against the 588 of the former return.

The importance of such a systematic account of our ports and harbours as it would befit a great maritime state to procure, is very distinctly indicated by the replies of various witnesses before the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation, having been elicited mainly by the enlightened questions of Sir George Balfour. The great drawback, it is admitted by Sir John Coode, the engineer of the Portland breakwater, to the improvement of harbours hitherto, has been the great number of failures that have taken place in harbour construction. As to these failures, which, if rightly chronicled and explained, would have a scientific value of the first order, a discreet silence has for the most part been maintained. The Government has expended, according to Sir G. Balfour, ten millions sterling, mainly in what are called harbours of refuge; and, with the exception of Portland, the general issue has been far from satisfactory. From 1829 to 1883 the Fishery Board of Scotland has spent 244,000*l.* on twenty-eight harbours, not one of which appears to be available at low water for the larger class of fishing boats. No information has been laid before Parliament to show that the Fishery Board has made any enquiry into the state of the harbours on which it has expended so much money. They

have been simply handed over to the localities when the work was done. In Ireland, naturally, the same neglect has occurred. The total expenditure on piers in Ireland during this century, according to a Parliamentary return (401, 1876), cited by Mr. Brady, Inspector of Irish Fisheries, up to the end of 1875, was 1,881,415*l.* Of this a little over 1,700,000*l.* was expended on the royal harbours of Kingstown, Howth, Dunmore, and Donaghadee; on Queenstown Admiralty pier; on the Galway docks; and on the Limerick drawbridge and floating docks. The balance, amounting, after sundry repayments, to 156,000*l.*, was expended upon fishery piers.

The coasts of the British Islands afford examples of almost every condition under which a harbour can be found, formed, or required. The tidal wave, generated in the unbroken expanse of the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, is deflected, divided, reduced, and again increased, both in speed and in height, in every conceivable way, in its rapid course around our shores. Thus at Courtown, on the Irish coast, owing to the interference of the branch tide coming up St. George's Channel with the southern flow of the ocean tide-wave, the rise of tide is almost wholly obliterated. At Portland the rise is only from six to seven feet, at Swanage only five feet, at Yarmouth six feet, at springs. At Sheerness, on the other hand, occurs a tidal range of seventeen feet, which is increased, in its passage up the Thames, to an oscillation which has been measured, as a maximum, at 28 feet 6 inches at Westminster. And the tidal rise of eighteen feet at the mouth of the Severn attains twenty-seven feet at Swansea, and has been known to register 43·80 feet at Avonmouth, where the Avon falls into the estuary of the Severn.

With this variation in impulsive force, of which the height of rise affords a natural scale of measurement, are combined such wide differences in the direction of the ocean currents, the force or bearing of local winds, and above all in the depth and the 'fetch' of the sea, or the distance for which an ocean wave, unchecked by a shallowing bottom, may rush towards the shore, as to present greater contrasts than could have been anticipated as possible on the face of the same planet. The sand banks piled up by the sea form an efficient protection to Yarmouth Roads. At Sumburgh Head in Shetland, the Sumburgh Roost, or race, one of the most formidable currents in those seas, which is more than three miles in width, when breaking and cresting heavily, serves as a breakwater at low tide; when there is comparatively little surf that reaches the shore. But no sooner, in

stormy weather, does the roost disappear towards high water, than a heavy sea rolls on the land, rising on the cliffs to a great height.

Mr. Thomas Stevenson, one of that gifted family of maritime engineers to whom North Britain is indebted for so many noble sea works, has given the attention of a lifetime to the problem of giving numerical expression to the forms, heights, and force of the waves. We must refer those who seek to grasp the subject in its full scientific clearness to the book on 'The Design and Construction of Harbours,' written by this gentleman, which is a republication, with many additions, of the article on harbours which he contributed to the 'Encyclopædia Britannica.' Full of formulæ and rules as the volume is, it smells strongly of the sea; it illustrates the poetry of science; and will be read with interest by many who will conscientiously skip its algebra and its arithmetic.

The height of the waves produced at sea in a storm depends mainly on the two conditions of the depth of the water through which they travel, and of the length of 'fetch,' or unbroken space, which extends from the shore. It follows that the most gigantic waves are produced where the sea rushes for the longest distance, and at the greatest depth, directly on the shore. In the long duel between man and nature, we here arrive at the term of human power. At Wick, with a fetch of about six hundred miles, waves of forty feet in height, from crest to trough, have been observed to smite the breakwater. Commander Dayman observed that the highest waves off the Cape of Good Hope rose twenty feet, the gales which produce them extending over a distance of from three hundred to six hundred miles. In the Atlantic Ocean, Dr. Scoresby measured the waves with great care and accuracy on different occasions. In March 1848, he wrote: 'In the afternoon of this day, I stood sometimes on the saloon deck or cuddy roof watching the sublime spectacle presented by the turbulent waters. I am not aware that I ever saw the sea more terribly magnificent.' Looking from the port paddlebox, he says:—

'I found at least one-half of the waves which overtook and passed the ship were far above the level of my eye. Frequently I observed long ranges (not acuminate peaks) extending 100 yards, perhaps, on one or both sides of the ship, the sea then coming nearly right aft, which rose so high above the visible horizon as to form an angle estimated at two or three degrees, when the distance of the wave summits was about 100 yards from the observer. This measure of elevation

was by no means uncommon, occurring, I should think, at least once in half a dozen waves. Sometimes peaks of crossing or crests of breaking seas would shoot upwards at least 10 or 15 feet higher.'

The mean highest waves, not including the broken or acuminate crests, Dr. Scoresby estimates as rising about forty-three feet above the level of the hollow occupied at the moment by the ship.

That the naval architect can build, and that the seaman can navigate, vessels that float amid such mountains of foaming water, may well excite the wonder of those who live at home at ease. But the harbour builder finds a limit placed on his work by the force of gales which the mariner outrides. The accounts of the phenomena produced by the wild and savage seas that lash the coasts of Northern Britain are so astounding, that it is not unnecessary to support the statements of an engineer, however eminent, by that of an independent and competent witness. When Sir Roderick Murchison gives evidence that, on a visit which he paid to Bound Skerry, all scepticism vanished as to the exactitude with which Mr. Stevenson described the results of the remarkable power of the sea waves when lashing upon the spot in great storms, the desk of the critic becomes a mere court of record.

At Whalsey, in Zetland, on the top of a rock called the Bound Skerry, which measures some 750 feet from S.W. to N.E., and about 500 feet from S.E. to N.W., and rises, with a rugged and irregular contour, to 85 feet above spring tide high water, heavy blocks of stone have been absolutely quarried, or hewn from the matrix, by the fury of the sea. It is hardly necessary to add the remark of Mr. Stevenson, that 'it must be distinctly understood that in such places the 'ordinary mode of construction cannot be applied.' The Bound Skerry is the most eastern of the Shetland group. It consists of quartz rock, penetrated to some depth by 'dries' or seams. No vegetation is found on its surface, with the exception of a species of lichen that grows on the higher parts. The rock is so solid that only 13·3 cubic feet go to the ton. On the south-east side, about 370 feet from the low-water mark, and at a height of 62 feet above that level, occurs a remarkable beach of irregular blocks, varying in size from 9½ tons downwards, and huddled together as if they lay only a few feet above the high-water level. Towards the north-east, at the level of 72 feet above the sea, among many smaller blocks lay one of 5½ tons in weight, which presented a fresh unweathered look that told of recent detachment.

Twenty feet off was the hole, fitting exactly by measurement, from which it had been actually quarried by the sea. On a lower rock on the south-east side of the Skerry was found a block of $7\frac{1}{2}$ tons in weight, at a level of 20 feet above the sea, wedged against a ledge of rock. The path over which this rock had been driven by the sea for a length of 73 feet was of the most irregular description, presenting abrupt steps of from 2 to 7 feet in height, and visible marks existed of the passage of the block along this course. Mr. Stevenson may well say, 'I landed on the Bound Skerry with what I thought tolerably certain and definite conceptions, not hastily adopted, but the result of nearly twenty years' study of the action of the waves at different parts of the coasts of Britain, but I came away with greatly altered views.'

We apprehend that the explanation of a phenomenon at first sight so incredible is to be found in the facts of the practical incompressibility of water, and the ready mode in which that fluid, when confined, may be made to transmit hydrodynamic force. The 'dries' or seams in the quartzose rock of the Skerries are, no doubt, when the sea lashes over its surface, filled with water. The height to which the crest of a wave may rise during a storm, after striking the shore line of the Shetlands, we have not seen stated. But at the Bishop Rock lighthouse a bell was broken from its attachments at a level of 100 feet above the high-water mark, during a gale in the winter of 1860, and at Unst, the most northern of the Zetland Islands, a door was broken open at a height of 195 feet above the sea. If a column of water descending from a height of from 100 to 200 feet above the surface of the Skerry rocks communicated the tremendous force given out during the fall to the filaments and layers of water isolating and underlying a piece of rock *in situ*, its removal by this means is not inexplicable.

Mr. Stevenson, indeed, holds that the most startling example on record of the force of the sea is that afforded by an artificial work. The bay of Wick, in Caithness, is a locality unusually exposed to the greatest force of the waves, especially in a south-easterly wind. In 1862 an Act of Parliament was obtained for the construction of a breakwater to shelter the craft employed in the herring fishery, on the designs of Messrs. D. and T. Stevenson. The bay of Wick has a sandy bottom, and the depth of the water in which the outer part of the breakwater had to be constructed was six fathoms at low water. The mode designed was first to deposit a mole of rubble, up to a height of 12 feet below low water, and then,

when that was supposed to have become consolidated by the sea, to form upon it a superstructure of masonry rising to 6 feet above high water, with a parapet rising to the height of 21 feet above that same level. The work was commenced in 1863, and by February 1868 the mole had been run out to a length of 1,050 feet, and the superstructure had been carried to within 230 feet of that distance. During the gale of December 20–22, 1868, serious damage was done to the breakwater, which was, however, repaired in the following year.

‘On the 6th of February, 1870, a severe storm commenced, which continued without intermission till the 8th. During this period of three days and three nights the breakwater was struck, at intervals varying from seven to ten minutes, by waves of extraordinary height and weight. Mr. Macdonald, the resident engineer, estimated some of the waves at 42 feet in height from crest to hollow. These waves on striking the wall, as shown by photographic views, rose to the height of not less than 150 feet, and passed over the top of the parapet, which is 21 feet above high water, in masses of solid blue water from 25 to 30 feet in depth.’ (Report to the Directors of the British Fishery Society, by D. and T. Stevenson, February 14, 1873.)

Three hundred and eighty feet in length of the breakwater was seriously damaged by this storm.

For the details of the counsel taken, and the works carried on, after this tempest, we must refer to the report cited. The narrative runs on to the 18th of December, 1872, when a storm arose of great fierceness, which continued till the 25th. At this time the end of the work was formed of three courses of blocks of cement concrete, weighing from 80 to 100 tons each. These were deposited on the rubble mole—Mr. Vernon Harcourt says five feet, but Mr. Stevenson’s elevation (Plate XI. of ‘The Construction of Harbours’) shows sixteen feet on the one side, and eighteen feet on the other—below low water. Above this foundation were courses of large stones set in cement, and the whole was surmounted by an immense monolith of cement rubble, measuring about forty-five feet by twenty-six feet, and eleven feet in thickness, which is said to have weighed upwards of 800 tons. This block was, of course, built up *in situ*. It was bolted to the uppermost of the three foundation courses by iron rods of three and a half inches diameter.

During the storm of December 18–25, 1872, Mr. Macdonald saw this enormous mass gradually slewed round by successive waves, until it was finally removed, and deposited inside of the pier. As soon as examination was possible, it was found that a mass, of no less than 1,350 tons in weight,

had been removed *en bloc*, and was resting entire on the rubble at the side of the pier, having sustained no damage but a slight fracture at the edges. The second course of cement blocks had also been swept away, and some of them were found entire near the head of the breakwater.

While we may at once admit that this prodigious displacement takes rank as the most serious catastrophe ever inflicted on an artificial work, apart from the use of gunpowder, we do not quite agree with Mr. Stevenson in regarding it as proving so prodigious a sea-stroke as those above cited on the Skerry rocks. The weight of a block of gneiss immersed in sea water is about one-fourth more than that of a concrete block, and the difference in the resisting power due to this difference of specific weight is quite enough to account for the failure of cement blocks where stone would have been safe. We may add that this serious source of weakness in the use of concrete for sea-work may be avoided to a great extent by the employment of an extremely heavy material, such as copper slag, instead of shingle or ordinary stone.

Again, we think there can be little doubt that the force of the sea was aided by a subsidence in the rubble mole. There is a difference of opinion among engineers as to the depth below low water at which such a structure is out of reach of damage from the waves. That, of course, must mainly depend on the height to which they rise at the locality. It is known that subsidence takes place, under the action of the sea, in rubble mounds. At Cherbourg, according to the late Admiral Washington, the settlement averaged eighteen inches in twenty-two feet, or one-fourteenth of the height. And it is probable that a heavy storm would produce a subsidence in a mole that had obtained a fair degree of consolidation under the action of less violent waves. It is also generally accepted that the trough of the wave lies as much below, as the crest rises above, the main water level, and that a wave breaks on coming into waters of a depth equal to half the distance from crest to hollow. Thus in face of such waves as those described by Mr. Macdonald, it is pretty clear that the rubble at Wick was carried up to a line too near low-water mark to be safe. That it actually yielded, after the superstructure was built (which was in the year following the deposit), appears to be as certain from the fact stated in Messrs. Stevenson's report, that 'the stones, though not displaced, were fractured,' by the gales of February 1872. That stones built in a wall may be cracked by the subsidence of foundation, we are well aware; but that they could be so

injured by such wave action as is described at Wick, we altogether disbelieve. We think, then, that the overthrow of the Wick breakwater may be traced to two distinct though concurring causes. In the first place, the rubble mole was carried too high to be within the limit of safety; and in the second place the specific gravity of the monolithic work was less than that required for efficient resistance to the seas of the locality.

We are not, however, disposed to admit that, either at the Skerries or at Wick Bay, the forces of nature must always triumph over the skill of the engineer. As to the former, if our explanation of the mode of the destructive action of the sea be the true one, that action can be at once arrested by grouting or running in with cement, or thin cement concrete, the seams that rive the rock. As to the latter, we hold that nothing has occurred to show that cement concrete of higher specific gravity, laid on a mole not carried higher than twenty-five feet below the low-water line, would fail. But Mr. Abernethy, whose forty years' experience of the work of a maritime engineer on our coasts is such as to fit him for a privy councillor of Neptune himself, speaks on the subject with a candour that gives double weight to his testimony.

'We have all made mistakes,' said Mr. Abernethy, and we have heard the same admission from the lips of Mr. Brunel. 'The former mode of constructing piers on the east coast of Scotland was by dry stone, building without mortar; but they are all demolished, there is scarcely one left. We knew little of concrete twenty years ago, and engineers generally did not believe in it. Since then, the manufacture of Portland cement has improved amazingly, and we can now manufacture concrete blocks in a very short time, much harder than sandstone. At the present time, I could carry out the works in a much less costly manner, and in a much shorter period of time.'

In fact the method of using artificial stone introduced at Fraserburgh and at the North Pier at Aberdeen, bids fair to put an end to the ticklish combination of sea walling and *pierre perdue*. By an ingenious method, for the details of which we must refer to the evidence of Mr. Abernethy, is built up a solid mass, on which the sea has no effect. Piling, rubble mounding, heavy staging, sea risk, are all avoided. A definite quantity of an appropriate material is thrown at once into scientifically chosen form, instead of an indefinite mass being left to the moulding action of the waves; and it is solid instead of being full of interstices. Time is saved, as well as cost, in proportion to the economy in materials, and a vertical sea wall is made to grow up, like a coral reef, from the very floor of the sea.

We think it probable that the next step to be taken, in cases where the 'fetch' of the sea is very long, and the ground swell very heavy, will be to run out a submerged breakwater of concrete at some little distance without, and parallel to, the harbour wall or inner breakwater, and to raise the latter vertically from the foundation. In such a case as that of Cherbourg or of Holyhead, a vertical monolithic wall sixty feet high and thirty feet wide, protected by a submerged mole from thirty to forty feet high, might have been substituted for the compound structure now in favour, with an economy of fully one-half of the cost.

Such being the forces of nature with which the harbour maker has to contend, and such being the present state of the science and practice of the defence of ports from the fury of the sea, let us glance at the admitted requirements of the English coasts in the way of harbours, and endeavour to contribute to the general knowledge of the subject a slight sketch of part of that systematic account of the ports and harbours of Great Britain in which our literature, official and scientific, is so grievously defective.

That part of the eastern coast of Scotland (according to data furnished to the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation by Sir F. Evans, R.N., K.C.B., the head of the Hydrographic Department of the Admiralty) which stretches in a south-westerly direction from Duncansby Head, on the Pentland Firth, to Cromarty Firth, contains, in a distance of about sixty-seven miles, fourteen artificial harbours, or about one to every five miles. Of these the fourth in number—we spare our readers the list of names—is that exposed bay of Wick and Pulteney, of which we have already spoken. The entrances of these harbours are all dry at low water, with the exception of Lock Fleet, with four, and Dornock Firth, with nine feet of water at that time of tide. The range of spring tides on the coast varies from eight feet in the Pentland, to fourteen feet in the Moray, Firth. Cromarty harbour, though small, is much used; but Wick bay would form, if protected, the most important shelter on this part of the coast.

From Cromarty Firth the shore line runs almost directly east for about seventy-five miles. There are nineteen harbours in this stretch of coast, or one to about every four miles. Of these, one, that of Hopeman, has a depth of four feet at low, and fifteen feet at high water; four, viz. Lossiemouth, Banff, Macduff, and Fraserburgh, have three feet at low, and thirteen or fourteen at high water, and the rest are

left dry by the outgoing tide. At Nairn, about twelve miles from Cromarty, is a pier six hundred yards long. Buckie, a thriving fishing station, has an entrance fifty feet wide to its harbour of three and a half acres; Banff has both an outer and an inner harbour; Pitullie has a pier two hundred yards long; and Fraserburgh, on which, in 1883, about 213,000*l.* had been expended (chiefly under the advice of Mr. Abernethy), has two harbours, one of them, with an area of nine and a half acres, being specially provided for fishing boats. About twenty acres of water, outside the harbour entrance proper, having a depth varying from six to sixteen feet at low-water spring tides, have been protected by a work called Balaclava Pier. Further works are recommended, which would increase the sheltered area to forty acres, available for fishing boats at all times of the tide, and for the larger class of coasting vessels at half tide. In the fishing season Fraserburgh gives shelter to six hundred and eighty boats, manned by 3,750 men.

From Rattray Head to the Tay, a distance of above eighty miles, the line of coast strikes in a direction parallel to that from Pentlands to Moray Firths. Ten harbours exist in this length. Of these Peterhead, about twelve miles south of Fraserburgh, has two harbours, one of eleven and one of seven acres area, with depths of four feet at low water, and fifteen and eleven respectively at high water. Seven hundred and eighty boats, manned by three thousand eight hundred men, frequent Peterhead in the fishing season. It is under contemplation to provide further shelter at Peterhead, to the extent of one hundred and thirty-one acres of four fathoms and upwards of water, at a cost of 500,000*l.* Passing the small ports of Boddam and Bullers of Buchan, both dry at low water, we come to Aberdeen, which has a depth of eight feet at low, and twenty at high water. Independently of the construction of the Victoria Docks at Aberdeen (which were completed in the year 1855-56), there has been expended on that port, in dredging, in the construction of the new south breakwater, in the extension of the north pier, on quays and wharves, and on the diversion of the river Dee into a new channel, the sum of 423,000*l.* A graving dock is now in course of construction. At the north pier of Aberdeen, and at Fraserburgh, Mr. Abernethy first introduced the simple (when once invented) method of building a monolithic mass by the deposit of one-hundred-ton bags of concrete before described.

Montrose has a dock of three acres, with six feet of water

at the entrance, at low water. Arbroath, only a foot deep at the entrance at low water, has a width of one hundred feet at the outer entrance, and an area of six acres. The Firth of Tay, eighteen feet deep at low, and thirty-four at high water, is navigable to Dundee for large ships. Stonehaven and Gourdon, dry at low water, are frequented in the fishing season.

Between the Firth of Tay and Berwick-on-Tweed occur twenty-five harbours, in a distance of about ninety miles, or one to every three and a half miles. Of these, twenty-one are dry at low water. At East Anstruther a new harbour, of six acres, with seven feet of water at low water at the entrance, was in course of construction in 1875, but we have sought in vain for particulars. Burntisland, with a minimum depth of entrance of four feet, has an entrance one hundred and twenty-five feet wide, an area of seventeen acres, and an improved depth of twenty feet. Granton, a noble work of the late Duke of Buccleuch, has an area of one hundred and thirty acres, a depth varying from ten to twenty-seven feet, and a width of entrance of four hundred feet. Leith also has ten feet water at the entrance at low tide, and an entrance width of two hundred and forty feet. It is characteristic of the want of information of which so many complaints have been made that neither in the book of Mr. Stevenson, nor in that of Mr. Vernon Harcourt, nor in the evidence before the Harbours Committee, do we find any mention of Inchkeith, with its recent works for the military defence of Leith harbour and the Firth of Forth. Eyemouth, although the entrance is dry at low water, has an opening one hundred and fifty-four feet wide, and room for thirty vessels; and according to a recent survey might be improved so as to afford about fifty acres of deep water for a large class of vessels, independent of its utility for her fishing boats. Lastly, Berwick, with four feet water minimum at the entrance of one hundred and twenty yards wide, has a depth within the harbour of eighteen feet at low water. But the bar at the mouth of the Tweed, and the large amount of detritus which that now brings down in flood, are unfavourable for the development of Berwick.

The paper prepared by Sir F. Evans, from which the greater part of the foregoing information has been gathered, is printed in the appendix to the report of the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation of 1883. The artificial harbours enumerated amount to sixty-eight, in a distance of three hundred and twelve miles. In the report of the same

committee in the following year, 1884, is printed, as already stated, a 'list of piers and harbours round the coasts of Great Britain and Ireland, prepared by the chairman (Mr. Marjoribanks) to accompany wreck charts.' This has been revised by Captain Langdon, R.N., of the Hydrographical Department of the Admiralty. It is illustrative of the need of definite, authoritative, and readily accessible information as to our harbours, that the latter list contains exactly double the number of harbours, over this stretch of coast, enumerated in the former list. It is possible that the explanation of this discrepancy may be found in the application of the term 'artificial' in Sir F. Evans's list, but there is nothing in the 'remarks' to show that this is the case. Thus, after Wick and Pulteney, the entries, 'Littleferry, four feet; Brough' and 'Tresgoe inlets, dry,' occur in the second list, but are omitted in the first.

Arriving thus at the southern limit of the eastern coast of Scotland, it may be well to place before the reader some idea of the harbour requirements of our coasts, as generally admitted. Different classifications are adopted by different writers, but the most simple and exhaustive seems to us to be the following.

The ports existing or required on the coasts of the United Kingdom are: (1) war ports, generally containing arsenals or dockyards, and necessarily fitted to give both maritime shelter and military defence to the vessels of the Royal Navy; (2) great commercial ports, which ought so far to resemble the military harbours as to be protected from hostile attack by proper defences; (3) harbours of refuge, to which vessels of any description may readily betake themselves for shelter in stress of weather; (4 and 5) harbours for coasting trade and for fishing purposes, between which it is not necessary to draw a hard line of distinction. Aberdeen, the Firth of Tay, and the Firth of Forth, serve as harbours of refuge on the three hundred miles of the storm-swept eastern coast of Scotland; and further works to shelter the harbour of Aberdeen, Fraserburgh, Eyemouth, and, more questionably, Peterhead, are all that are recommended by Mr. Abernethy as of national importance. As to the improvement of the fishery harbours, it appears to be, in the most unequivocal sense of the word, a thoroughly remunerative object of expenditure.

Coming south from Berwick, along the eastern coast of England, twelve harbours, according to Sir F. Evans, exist in the 125 miles of shore that extends to Flamborough Head. Of these the most important are the mouths of the rivers

Tyne and Tees, the one with twenty and the other with fourteen feet minimum depth of water at the entrance. Holy Island harbour has eight feet of water on the bar, and Hartlepool nine feet at the entrance during low water, and twenty-four feet at high water. North Sunderland, Blyth, Seaham, Scarborough, and Bridlington have their entrances dry at low water, and Warkworth, Sunderland, and Whitby have respectively two, three, and one foot of water, at the same time of tide.

On this extent of English coast, the general assent of the authorities on the subject is in favour of the construction of a harbour of refuge. A line drawn to the north on the magnetic meridian of Cromer passes over the deepest part of the German Ocean, with the exception of a second and still deeper channel, which hugs the west coast of Norway. On the English coast to the west of the deep-sea line, the boldest promontory is that of Flamborough Head. The heel of the Dogger Bank lies, at a distance of fifty miles, opposite this great sea mark; and the channel between runs in depth from eighteen to twenty-eight fathoms. The mouth of the Elbe lies in the same easterly direction, and a straight course from Bridlington, a little to the south of Flamborough Head, to Heligoland, clears the Dogger Bank and the White Bank to the north, and the Well Bank to the south. The entrance to the Baltic, which the Jutland Reef so deflects as to throw the fair way for southward-going vessels to the west of the Dogger Bank, is thus in close relation to the same point of departure as the entrance to the Elbe. And from the Dutch coasts, there is the choice either of a somewhat difficult route to the Thames, or a fair course into the above-named marine highway from Heligoland towards Bridlington. South of Flamborough Head, the access to the English seaboard is by the Humber.

The evidence before the Harbour Committee defines Filey, Bridlington, and Hartlepool, as the three spots between which lies the choice of the best site for a harbour of refuge. Further information is perhaps requisite to turn the balance in either direction. But the costly works that are being carried on in extension of breakwaters at the mouth of the Tees are such as to furnish an argument against the expenditure of national money at so closely neighbouring a spot as Hartlepool; so that the choice may be held to lie between Filey and Bridlington. As to this it may perhaps be said, that while for any vessel embayed in an on-shore gale between Scarborough and Flamborough Head a refuge in Filey Bay

would be desirable, the commanding position of Flamborough Head is such as to afford signals of unrivalled perspicuity to vessels out in the fairway of trade.

'A white tower, 87 feet high, on this promontory shows a white and red flashing light, which is visible at a distance of twenty-one miles. No light exists on the shore, nor is there any site for the erection of one, of such a wide sea range as this. On the Spurn Point, to the south, the extreme range of the high light is fifteen miles. At High Whitby, on the north, a red light from a tower over the Scar Rock has a range of twenty-three miles; but the outside of the creek from which this becomes visible at sea is comparatively out of the way of any but coasting traffic. No other light is visible at twenty miles from the coast between Cromer and Souter Point. The lighthouse accommodation has to be regarded not only as a fact, but as an indication. In the careful surveys that have been made of our coasts, the most available sites for lighthouses have been systematically adopted. Thus, in weather when a harbour is in request, the distance from which the light on Flamborough Head can be sighted at sea is a matter almost, or quite, as important as the accessibility of the position for the accommodation of the great maritime movement which is offered by its site.' *

It is probably safest to conclude that while for fishing and coasting traffic such a situation as that of Filey Bay ought to be provided with a port of refuge for vessels caught by rough weather in the embayment, Bridlington offers the greatest facilities for giving shelter to foreign vessels. Flamborough Head is said in 'The North Sea Pilot,' a book published by order of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, to be 'the common point of arrival or departure for all 'vessels passing to the northward or southward along the 'eastern coast, as well as for those sailing between the 'Humber and the Baltic.' And with regard to the attempt to make an embayed port, if any other is available, the same authoritative publication in speaking of the mouth of the Tees, to some extent a natural harbour, gives the following caution:—

'From the character of the entrance to the Tees it should never be resorted to for shelter in an on-shore gale, if it can by any possibility be avoided. To touch upon either of the *gares* (the breakwaters at the mouth of the Tees) would be nearly certain destruction. . . . At a distance of $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles S.S.W. of Flamborough Head, a narrow shoal, known as the Smithie, extends for three miles in a south-westerly direction. It is covered by only ten feet of water at low-water springs, and has a hard chalk or limestone bottom. Inside of this shoal is the roadstead of Bridlington Bay, with water of the same

depth as that within Plymouth Breakwater, and a passage of six fathoms deep round its northern end. The holding ground here is so good that the "Sailing Directions" state that "vessels well found in ground" "tackling frequently ride out a gale from the eastward from the protection afforded by the Smithie." The comparatively simple and inexpensive work of constructing a breakwater on the Smithie is all that is necessary to convert Bridlington Bay into a harbour of refuge; and, say the "Sailing Directions," "considering the eligibility of the site, the enormous numbers of vessels constantly passing, and the difficulty which is often experienced in making the Humber in easterly gales, the establishment of such a work would be a national boon."

If the point most available for the protection of the twelve million tons of shipping that frequent the fairway of the North Sea be that which should be selected for a harbour, there cannot be much doubt as to the true locality. The report of 1884 adopts the opinion of Mr. Stevenson that the function of a harbour of refuge is 'not to rescue a vessel from a dangerous trap into which she has fallen, but to afford a place to which a vessel can run before she is in danger;' a consideration which goes far to be conclusive in this case.

From Flamborough Head to Dover the information supplied by the list of harbours published by the Select Committee is of the scantiest kind. Forty-four ports are enumerated, most of which are of little importance. Of the Humber, affording access to Hull and Grimsby, it is only remarked, 'Spacious accommodation (docks) and numerous anchorages.' Yarmouth Roads are not mentioned, nor is any notice taken of the Downs. Of the 'River Thames and London,' it is only said, 'Depth off Leigh Shoal, twenty-three feet at low-water spring tide;' while the comment on Rochester is, 'Medway river can be navigated at any time,' and Sheerness is said to be 'available at all times.' A 'pier, 1,100 feet long, ten feet at end at low water,' is said to exist at Deal; and no further information worth extracting is supplied as to this long reach of coast line. Nor has much more attention been directed by the report to the long line of the south coast. There are works mentioned as in progress at Newhaven which, when complete, will give a depth of ten feet of water at the entrance at low water. Portsmouth has from fifteen to sixteen feet of water at the entrance to the Camber. Southampton, with a spacious entrance, has only two fathoms on the bar at low-water spring tides. Christchurch is marked as 'dry,' and no notice is taken of the remarkable phenomenon of the blocking-up of

the outfalls of the rivers Stour and Avon by a moving wall of shingle. 'A pier with eighteen feet water at the end at 'high-water spring tide' is credited to Swanage, but not a word is said as to the much larger and more important pier at Bournemouth. At Poole there is a depth of six and a half feet, at Weymouth one of eight feet of water at the entrance at low water. Portland, under the shelter of an inner and an outer breakwater, with an entrance nine fathoms deep between the two, is characterised as 'Available at all times. 'Spacious.' Lyme Regis, also dry, is marked as giving 'good 'shelter for small vessels.' We find no notice in either of the works before us of the peculiar name given to the sea wall of that little harbour (shared only, we think, by Lynn Regis in Norfolk, and by Scarborough), namely, Cob, a word that we do not find in the dictionary. In each case, as far as memory serves, the structure is a curved sea wall, with a low parapet. Exmouth, where the Exe, draining 584 square miles of country, falls into the sea, has only five feet of water, and is 'not to be depended on for refuge in bad weather.' At Brixham is an unfinished breakwater giving some shelter. Dartmouth is a spacious harbour, with thirty feet depth and 220 yards width at the entrance. The Yealm river has ten feet depth at low water for ten miles inside its entrance, and Truro has nine and a half feet at the quay at high-water spring tide. The spacious area protected by the Plymouth breakwater contains six several ports, each of them, except Sutton Pool, with three and a half fathoms of water at the minimum; while Falmouth offers a capacious and secure anchorage, with from nine to ten fathoms of water at the entrance to the outer harbour, which vessels of the heaviest draught can enter at all times of tide.

It is impossible within the limits at our disposal to skirt further the coasts of the islands, or even to enter on the question of the relative importance of the different harbours for the improvement of which so many and such excellent arguments are adduced. It is, however, the less necessary to do this, inasmuch as the conclusions of the report of the Select Committee on Harbour Accommodation are such that, for the most part, we are happy fully to concur with them.

The report commences by a reference to the sittings and the report of the committee originally appointed on May 10, 1883. After examining 168 witnesses, and considering 177 petitions, that committee recommended the allotment of 250,000*l.* out of the Irish Church Fund for the improvement

and construction of fishery harbours in Ireland, in accordance with which recommendation the Sea Fisheries (Ireland) Bill, 1883, was passed into law. A further recommendation of the committee as to the reduction of interest on loans by the Public Works Commissioners has not as yet been adopted.

During the whole course of the enquiry the committee has been hampered by the difficulty of obtaining correct official information as to the condition of the harbours on the coasts of the United Kingdom. They recommend in consequence such a strengthening of the Harbour Department of the Board of Trade as will enable it to superintend all the harbours of the United Kingdom, and, further, that a statutory obligation should be laid on all harbour authorities to make an annual return, in a form to be decided on by the Board of Trade. As to the importance of attaining these objects there can be but one opinion.

On this point, however, it is essential to notice that, in transferring the general supervision of the harbours of England from the Admiralty to the Board of Trade, great risk is incurred of a neglect of the maritime defence of the country. The Admiralty, whether efficient or otherwise in the discharge of the duties of supervision, is at all events an authority conversant with naval attack and defence, and has, at least with regard to the military ports, been accustomed to give attention to the means of warding off hostile attack. The Board of Trade has no such knowledge, habit, or function; nor are we aware that its officials have at any time shown that they were conscious of the fact that, in the event of a maritime war, the defences of our great commercial ports are extraordinarily defective. The nomination of some naval authority that should be responsible for the general system of our coast defences is thus a very necessary consequence of the attribution of the administrative control of our harbours to the Board of Trade.

The committee repeat the remark made in the report of 1883 that the question of refuge was not specially referred to them to investigate; the subject having been enquired into by the Parliamentary Committee of 1857 and 1858, and the Royal Commission of 1859 and 1860. During the five years from 1876 to 1882, they report the number of ascertained shipping casualties on or near the coasts of the United Kingdom as averaging 3,300 per annum; out of which 497 vessels per annum were totally lost, and 738 lives were also lost in each year. They observe that on the east coast of Great Britain,

with the exception of the natural advantages afforded by the estuary of the Thames, by the Firth of Forth, and by the Cromarty Firth, there is not a single harbour which is adapted for the general requirements of the navy in time of war. Two works, one at Dover and the other at Peterhead, have been determined on by the Government, and are to be carried out by convict labour; and the committee recommend the simultaneous construction of a third harbour of refuge on the north-east coast of England.

They are also of opinion, without attempting to determine between the respective claims of St. Ives, Lundy Island, the Mumbles, and Swansea, that at one of these places a harbour should be constructed without delay, for the service of that portion of our coasts which extends from Land's End to the Welsh coast; and they repeat the recommendation of last session that the formation of a harbour of refuge on the west coast of Ireland is worthy of immediate consideration.

But the most novel and, under existing circumstances, probably the most important recommendation of the committee is found in section 20 of their report. In speaking of the different classes of ports and harbours (p. 34), we placed at the head of the list a form of harbour for any notice of which we look in vain in the index of either Mr. Stevenson's or Mr. Vernon Harcourt's book, viz. war ports, fitted to give both maritime shelter and military defence to the vessels of the Royal Navy. The Report of 1883 on Harbour Accommodation contains no reference to this important branch of the subject; but in that of 1884 the 'committee wish to express in the strongest terms their conviction of the absolute necessity that no further delay should take place in the construction of the national harbours to which it has alluded. The new appliances of modern warfare have increased greatly the necessity of these works since the period of the Commission of 1859.' On this point the committee adopt the language of Sir Frederick Evans:—

'It appears to me essential that, in consequence of the extraordinary advances that have been made in modern war appliances, it becomes necessary to look out now to secure our ships against the contingencies that will arise by the new elements introduced into modern warfare. Take our three great anchorages which our fleets in olden times used, the Downs, Hollesley Bay just north of Harwich, and Yarmouth Roads. A fleet of merchant ships could not at the present day lie at these places in security. They would require a powerful fleet to encompass them as it were against the attack of torpedo boats. . . . The

necessity presents itself of having large enclosed spaces as a refuge not so much from the winds as from the enemy.'

The committee justly hold that to delay the construction of national harbour works for the sake of the miserable economy to be secured by the use of convict labour, is a great mistake. 'They therefore recommend that the capital necessary for the construction of these harbours which they 'have suggested should be found at the public expense,' as in the similar case of the construction of fortifications.

The way in which the chief countries of Continental Europe regard the propriety of a State expenditure on harbours is illustrated by a statement which the chairman of the committee has extracted from the consular reports published by the Board of Trade. Omitting the details, which will be found on page ix of the report, this expenditure has been as under during the last twenty years:—Holland has expended on three harbours, 2,500,000*l.*; France, on seventeen harbours, 11,176,632*l.*; Belgium, on two harbours, 2,720,000*l.* Germany has laid out 1,110,379*l.* on five harbours; while at Danzig, Wilhelmshaven, Königsberg, and Memel, an unknown but enormous cost has been supported by the State. Spain has expended 1,720,381*l.* on seven harbours, besides making an annual payment of 6,000*l.* to Huelva. And Italy has laid out 1,536,233*l.* on seventeen harbours, including three in the island of Sardinia, besides an unknown sum at Spezia. These six States, in a word, have spent 432,000*l.* apiece on forty-eight harbours, and larger sums on four or five more.

The preservation and improvement of ocean harbours is so closely connected with that of the navigation of tidal rivers, that it is difficult to draw the line between the two. In an article on the subject of inland navigation,* we mentioned the fact that, owing to the great improvements carried out in deepening the Clyde and the Tyne, during the twenty years from 1861 to 1881, the revenue of the Clyde Trust has increased by 125 per cent. and that of the Tyne Commissioners by 248 per cent. The increase in the total tonnage entering and clearing Middlesborough, during the same period of time, has been 158 per cent. The cases of these rivers differ from that of the Thames (which we have heard experienced mariners call the best harbour in the world), chiefly in the fact that while Nature herself has formed the latter, although aided by the intelligent ministry of

man, it has required the unabated toil of the engineer to dredge and deepen the narrow channels of the Northumbrian and Durham rivers.

In the treatment of tidal rivers, such as those which drain the watershed valleys of England, it is now generally accepted by the hydraulic engineer that the ruling principle should be to carry the low-water sea level as far inland as possible. As regards the primary function of the river, the discharge of water from the land, this statement may perhaps be sufficient. But with reference to navigation, and as an element in that steady improvement of navigable channels which is the only alternative to steady deterioration, something more is required. The width and depth to which a channel has to be excavated in order to carry out the requisite above stated depends on the volume of water which it is designed to carry down to the sea. But an entirely different order of considerations arises from the behaviour of the tidal wave. This cosmical phenomenon is directly subjected to mathematical law. The tidal wave rushes up a regularly formed river channel with a speed that entirely depends on the depth from the crest of the wave to the bottom of the channel. Thus, while it has been argued, in the early days of English engineering, that it was unnecessary to deepen a channel beyond the depth requisite for drainage, as no water would be sent up or down in the submerged part of the channel in addition to that passing through the shallower section, this view was only held in ignorance of the phenomena of wave motion. The tidal action, due to the free and apparently automatic movements of the celestial bodies, when once originated, has a life of its own; and its movement, while varying as the depth, is mainly independent of the current of the river into which it is admitted.

Thus, in the lower part of the Clyde, where the water is from twenty to thirty feet deep, the tidal wave ascends at a velocity of twenty miles an hour. As the river becomes shelving and shallow, with a mean depth of from three to five feet, the velocity of the tide-wave falls to eight miles an hour; while in ascending higher up, where the banks are nearly upright, and the contracted width gives an increase of mean depth, the velocity of the wave has a corresponding increase to fifteen miles per hour.

This remarkable action of the tidal wave, which has only been accurately known for comparatively a short time, forms the controlling condition of the use and of the improvement

of tidal rivers as harbours. Nor is it only in velocity that the wave varies, accommodating itself to the depth of the channel much as a horse slackens or increases his speed in ascending or descending a hill. The impulse, once given, maintains its energy until it is exhausted by mechanical causes. If the channel narrows without losing its depth, the wave rises in height. Mr. Thomas Stevenson has furnished the engineering profession with the first practical rules as to the generation and force of waves which give numerical values instead of mere guesses. To his invention of, and observations by, the 'marine dynamometer' is due the knowledge of the facts that the force of the sea in the German Ocean reaches an amount equal to $3\frac{1}{2}$ tons on the square foot; that the height of the waves caused by the wind increases in the proportion of the square roots of the 'fetches,' or distances passed over by the wind; and that on the east coast of Britain the waves continually increase in magnitude as we go from Holland north to Shetland with south-east gales, while the converse is true coming south with north-easterly gales. This refers to the storm-wave, which differs in many details from the tide-wave. But they both agree in the fact that, when the wave is once formed, a constriction of the channel along which it passes produces an increase, and an expansion produces a decrease, in the height of the wave itself, a variation which Mr. Stevenson notes to be in the inverse ratio of the square roots of the widths.

It is thus evident that on the depth and width of an estuary, or river channel, flowing into a tidal sea, depend the two facts of the speed with which the tide-wave ascends a river, and of the height which its crest will attain, under given conditions, at a given point. And it is no less certain that any attempt to improve or to alter the outfalls of such rivers as the Seine, the Dee, or the Mersey, that is made without due regard to this law, is likely to end in disaster, as indeed is being very rapidly shown in the estuary of the Seine.

The heaping up, under certain circumstances, of the tidal wave, is well known in the Seine, the Severn, and some other rivers, under the name of the bore, or egre. In the case of the Seine the phenomenon is the most imposing, or at all events is most familiar as such to our memory. This river, which is nearly seven miles wide opposite Havre, undergoes three constrictions, to widths of four miles, three miles, and one mile, at distances of $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles, 15 miles, and $18\frac{1}{2}$ miles from its mouth. At the second of these contractions, that between Pointe de la Roque and Tancarville, the bore

attains its first considerable development, rushing up like a wall of water, with a toppling crest considerably higher than the subsequent high-water level. At Quillebœuf, which may be called the end of the estuary proper, the height attained is said to be at times from ten to twelve feet. Looking down the river from the point of Quillebœuf, at the time of an equinoctial spring tide, a white bar of foam may be seen, stretching from bank to bank, and rapidly nearing the observer. Not unfrequently a thick cloud hangs low over the river, and accompanies the bore in its progress. As it reaches Quillebœuf, the roar and splash of the wave is accompanied by wild bursts of wind, and even by hail, thunder, and lightning. As the bore passes, and high water gradually spreads itself over the submerged sand banks, the cloudy veil accompanies it in its ascent towards Rouen, and clear skies and bright sun return on the lower part of the estuary.

Very similar, although of less magnitude, are the phenomena of the bore in the Severn. The tidal range at the mouth of this river, at Avonmouth Dock, has been measured at the extraordinary height of 43·80 feet. (It should be noted that Mr. Stevenson has allowed himself to print without correction the erroneous statement (page 330) that spring tides rise sixty feet at the mouth of the Wye, and seventy feet at Chepstow.) Opposite Weston-super-Mare the estuary of the Severn is ten miles wide, while it contracts to less than one mile at Beachley, which Mr. Beardmore regarded as the mouth of the river proper. Above this constriction the river again expands, being a little more than two miles wide at the fourth mile, and again contracting to half a mile at Sharpness, $10\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Beachley. Above Sharpness it again expands to a width of a mile and a half near Gatcombe, and only assumes the form of a regular channel on turning sharply to the west near Awre. These successive contractions and expansions in width are accompanied by corresponding variations in depth, ranging from seventy-eight feet below high-water level at Sharpness, to thirty-one feet below the same datum at the thirty-first mile; while the bed rises at the inclination of thirteen inches in a mile. It is against the rapid current due to this fall that the tide-wave ascends at a speed varying from eight to twenty-two feet per second, giving, when a wind aids the lift of the water, a bore of as much as six feet in height.

In the cases of the Seine, the Severn, and the Solway, the phenomenon of the bore, due to the funnel-shaped mouth of the estuary, is very hostile to navigation. The constriction

in the Seine (neglecting the irregularities of shore line) is at the rate of about twenty-five per cent., or one foot in four, measured from Havre to Tancarville, or of 22·8 per cent. from Honfleur to Quillebœuf. The ratio of the contraction of the Severn (also neglecting the expansions) is about forty per cent., giving a loss of one foot in width to every two and a half feet of course; while the Solway, another estuary famous for the rapidity of its bore, contracts, in a distance of thirty-five miles, from a width of twenty-five to one of under three miles. We thus obtain a measure of that degree of contraction in the mouth of a tidal river which seriously militates against its value as a harbour.

It appears, whether we reason deductively from the known laws of the movement of the tidal wave up a river channel, or inductively from the recorded phenomena of rivers of opposite proportions, that the natural value of a river as a harbour, as well as a mode of access to the interior of a country, depends on ascertainable conditions; and that it is only by conforming to those conditions that the engineer can properly attempt to do, by art, what has not been already done by nature. The efficiency of a tidal outfall for both drainage and navigation depends mainly on the two elements of the regular depth, and the taper, or proportionate contraction, of its channel.

Where, as in the cases of the Clyde and of the Tyne, the taper is very slight (very little more than 1 per cent. in the first-named river), a sufficient quantity of tidal water is not admitted to scour out a navigable channel. The water of the river itself, unaided by tidal flow, is generally inadequate for this purpose. The aid of man is required, to excavate, and occasionally to maintain, a navigable channel in a narrow river; and to make the mouth of such a river serve as a harbour is a purely artificial procedure.

On the contrary, where, as in the cases of the Seine, the Severn, and the Cheshire Dee, the taper of the funnel-shaped entrance is as rapid as from 45 to 20 per cent., the effect of the river flow becomes almost imperceptible, in proportion to the tidal libration; the currents vary with changing winds and tides; sandbanks are deposited throughout the estuary, between which the channel wanders with a caprice difficult to anticipate or to understand; and the navigable character of the river is impaired or destroyed.

Intermediate between the inadequate taper of the Clyde, and the unmanageable taper of the Seine, is the moderate taper of the Thames, which may be approximately taken at

10 per cent., or one foot lost in width for every ten feet of the course of the river. The room thus afforded for the influx of tidal water is so ample that Mr. Redman, who has long made a special study of the river Thames, shows * that the volume of fresh water flowing out of the Thames in twelve hours is only equal to $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the volume of tidal water that enters the channel of the river up to Teddington. The low-water depth, which is somewhat irregular, may be taken as gradually diminishing from between thirty-five and forty, to twenty feet in depth, in the section of the river terminating at London Bridge. Under these conditions, a tidal rise of seventeen feet at Sheerness is increased to one of twenty-three feet at Shadwell. An oscillation of twenty-eight feet six inches has been measured at Westminster, where high water has been known to rise five feet above, and (unexpected as the statement may be) low water to ebb four feet below, the corresponding high and low water at Sheerness. Moreover, under the care of the present Conservators, and owing mainly to the judicious dredging, and to the removal of impediments in the channel, the tidal range of the Thames is steadily, though slowly, increasing. (This fact explains the existence of certain sills or stepping courses of stone, which are to be found on the river entrances to the Thames Embankment, and are otherwise inexplicable.) It is not a matter of good promise to the inhabitants of the low-lying districts of Southwark. But as rivers never sleep, and are continually either improving or deteriorating their channels, the growth of the tidal range of the Thames is of good omen to the port of London.

Without, therefore, asserting that a taper of one in ten is, under all circumstances, the exact proportion which the hydraulic engineer should endeavour to maintain, it is evident that it is an excellent proportion; while it is no less clear that neither a taper of one in one hundred on the one hand, nor one of one in four on the other hand, is consistent with the adaptability of a river-mouth to serve as a natural harbour—meaning by that, a harbour formed by nature (as at Milford Haven) with little or no aid from man.

The appreciation of those conditions which, as forming the best natural river harbours, should be, as far as possible, introduced by any effort to improve the harbourage and inlet afforded by a river falling into the sea, is of great interest with regard to such a case as that which has been so

* Proc. Inst. C.E. vol. xlix. pp. 68-73.

sharply debated in Parliament, of the proposed Manchester Ship Canal. It is desirable to speak with some reserve as to that part of the original project which, approved by the Conservators of the Mersey, and by a committee of either House of Parliament, was on the other hand condemned by a committee of either House, and finally abandoned by the promoters. Neither do we wish to say anything that could interfere with the prosecution of a great national work, of that class which is most urgently required by the exigencies of our manufactures, and of which the need, as well as the remunerative prospect, in the case of the traffic of Manchester, is abundantly proved. But the question of the improvement of the harbourage which is now so imperfectly afforded by the Mersey, is, perhaps, even of more importance than that of the immediate completion of the proper mode of transport between Liverpool and Manchester.

The first scheme proposed for giving Manchester free access to the sea was founded upon the sound hydraulic canon before cited, that of carrying the low-water sea level as far inland as possible. Investigation of the subject, however, soon showed the impracticability of a scheme involving an excavation of eighty-five feet in depth at the Manchester terminus. A large and influential meeting, comprising among other members the Mayors of Salford, Ashton, Warrington, Macclesfield, Stockport, and Staleybridge, was held on June 27, 1882, and a detailed survey was ordered for the purpose of deciding on the best design for the canal. Extraordinary enthusiasm was kindled on the subject in Manchester. Nor is that matter for wonder when it is known that owing to the combination of the railway companies with the managers of the Bridgewater Canal, and of the neglected and disused Irwell navigation, the cost of sending cotton backwards and forwards between Liverpool and Manchester was actually more in 1882 than that for which it could have been effected by a well-organised system of wagon transport on the ordinary highway.

We can only speak in the language of sympathy and of admiration of the efforts of those patriotic men, who having twice, at a very large cost, fought a Parliamentary battle for the authorisation of a ship canal from Manchester to the deep part of the channel of the Mersey, near Garston, twice victorious and twice beaten, have again applied to Parliament in the session of 1885. Opposed by Liverpool, opposed by the railway companies, opposed by the Bridgewater Canal Company, it may well be the case that the steps taken

from time to time by the Provisional Committee were the best possible under the circumstances of the day. But yet it cannot be said that either Manchester or Liverpool, the Conservators of the Mersey, or the committee of either House of Parliament, rose to the full height of the important question brought forward. That a very great saving to the manufacturers of a vast industrial district would be effected by the opening of such a line of communication, is as indisputable as are the figures that showed the probability of a fair commercial return on the capital required for the work. But, opposed as it was on narrow local grounds, the Manchester project failed to assume its true grandeur as a national enterprise. In the sharp fight that soon declared itself, the effect of the proposed work on the navigation of the Mersey was the main issue on which decision after decision was arrived at. The promoters of the canal brought forward the evidence of experts to show that they would not interfere with the present navigable character of the Mersey. As to whether the original plan of 1883 would or would not have done so, and how far the same may be asserted of the very different plan of the present year, this is not the place in which to offer a decided opinion. But that the Mersey is disgraced by a bar which it would not be difficult for the engineer to remove, is a fact as to which there can be little dispute. That the first condition of any interference with the actual state of the Mersey should be the adoption of measures to remove the bar, and to bring the deep water now existing at Garston as far up the river as Runcorn, at the very least, must be admitted by any impartial judge. This done, the construction of a canal, of any requisite dimensions, from Runcorn to Manchester would have been a work very difficult to oppose, except on grounds of the most palpable selfishness. Nor should all the advantage that is promised to Lancashire by the establishment of a new inlet from the ocean allow any tribunal to be blind to the importance of requiring not only that the actual state of the Mersey should not be deteriorated, but that that most desirable improvement of the port which should render it free of access at all times, and give a free navigation up to the very head of the estuary, should not hereafter be rendered more difficult of execution by reason of any powers now accorded to the constructors of the canal.

This consideration is enforced by the rapid effect that the training of the River Seine, between La Mailleraye and Berville, has already had in silting up the estuary. It ap-

pears from M. Estignard's '*Reconnaissance hydrographique à l'embouchure de la Seine*,' that since the diminution of the tidal flow which has been caused by the canalisation of this part of the river, the rate of deposit in the western portion of the estuary has more than doubled; and that it amounted, in the year 1875, to upwards of 13,000,000 cubic yards. The resemblance between the plan of 'The Amended Manchester Ship Canal,' from Irlam to Eastham, and the embanked course of the Seine from Vieux Port to Berville, is too close not to awaken some apprehension with regard to the effect of the proposed works on the Mersey.

We have considered that our readers would take more interest in such a sketch as our limits would allow of our general knowledge as to the ports and harbours of the United Kingdom, and of the measures proposed or in progress for improving our information, as well as for giving shelter to our mariners, than would be excited by dwelling at length on the details of the technical works named at the head of the article. Mr. Vernon Harcourt has published two handsome volumes, one of text, and the other containing sixteen folded plates, which form companions to his work on Rivers and Canals, reviewed by us rather more than two years ago. He has improved on the method of that work, the information contained in which was principally abstracted from the Proceedings of the Institute of Civil Engineers, by obtaining plans and detailed information from some thirty-eight engineers out of those responsible for the 104 ports to be found in his index. The book, as will be seen from a glance at the numbers of harbours cited, is not an attempt to give any account of the principal ports and harbours of the world, or even of the United Kingdom, but is really a treatise on the construction of harbours, of which the various plans and descriptions cited are illustrations. After preliminary chapters on the object of harbours and docks, the motion of waves, the tidal rise, and the various littoral currents, thirteen chapters are given to the details of the various combinations of jetties, moles, and breakwaters, in the construction of which, down to very recent times, modern engineers have been far from attaining the excellence of design and workmanship at which, 1,500 or 2,000 years ago, the Phœnician engineers of Tyre and of Carthage had arrived. Indeed, the book may be taken as marking an epoch of transition, and summing up the history of various struggles on the part of man with winds and waves, which are altogether unlikely to be repeated in the same form. As to this, the Committee of 1884 are at one with

us, having been, they state in their report, 'much impressed' with the practical unanimity of opinion expressed by many eminent engineers, that 'the best system for piers and breakwaters is to be found in building them up in solid monolithic works of concrete.' The preceding remark does not, of course, apply to the chapter on lighthouses, or to the second part of the volume, treating of docks. But the plan of the work has required so much brevity in the description of any particular works of this kind as to form rather an index than a treatise. It should be noted, by the way, that the index to the volume is exceptionally good, and that the illustrations are admirably produced. With somewhat of an academic aspect—and, we should conceive, first drawn up as lectures—the volumes form a valuable addition to the library of the engineer.

Mr. Stevenson's treatise rather regards the principles of the design, than the details of the construction, of harbours. It contains much that is original, as well as a clear and distinct statement of admitted facts and laws; and the quotations that we have made are probably enough to show the interest which the perusal will excite. We regret that we have not been able to ascertain how far the edition now in the press contains additions to the second edition, which is that which we have consulted.

We cannot take leave of this important subject without an earnest appeal to all those who are interested in the material welfare of England, in support of the recommendations of the committee as far as they regard the collection and publication of correct information with regard to the condition of the harbours of the United Kingdom. The total absence of that systematic knowledge of elementary and controlling facts which we have previously had occasion to lament with reference to the rivers of England applies with no less force to its ports and harbours. It is a scandal to the civilisation of England that the kind of information which the Governments of France, Italy, Belgium, and other States so sedulously collect, and so carefully publish, with regard to the great natural and artificial means of communication, and facilities for trade, should be absolutely wanting in the United Kingdom. Committee after committee, commission after commission, has devoted time to the independent collection of facts, which ought to be all clearly ascertained, made perfectly accessible, and corrected from year to year.

Private enterprise can expect no remuneration for a toil

which, in almost every other civilised country, it is considered one of the first duties of the State to originate or to encourage. Connected with this total want of even an index to our system of harbours, or of inland water communications, is the wasteful and improvident manner in which money voted for public works has been laid out, and the neglect, decay, and total want of inspection, of which the evidence was elicited by the committee. It is not to harbours alone that the words of the report apply:—

‘The evidence before your committee has brought to light a defect which should be guarded against in future harbour works carried out by means of loans of public money; that is, the failure on the part of the Public Works Loan Commissioners to cause sufficient inspection to be made of harbour works, assisted by loans from them while in progress. Your committee strongly recommend that all such works in course of construction by the aid of public funds should be subject to an independent inspection, and are of opinion that this inspection would best be carried out under the superintendence of the Board of Trade.’

We cannot close this article without pointedly calling attention, in the most serious tone, to the question of the maritime defence of our great ports. In the whole of the harbour literature that we have had under review this main element of national safety has been overlooked. The defences of our military ports have been studied; and we have repeated what the Commission has said as to what may be called war ports of refuge. But as to the defences of the Mersey, the Clyde, the Tyne, or any other river, we look in vain for the indication that any human being has thought it his duty to give any heed to the subject. From Glasgow, indeed, there has come a note of alarm; and the attention of Government has been called to the wholly unprotected state of the Clyde. So long as a naval war is possible, the duty of placing in security our great commercial ports is one of the utmost importance. More than two million inhabitants are grouped on our seaboard, in twenty-four points. That these points can be put in a complete state of defence is, we trust, the case. That they are not so cared for now, Glasgow, at least, testifies. That they ought to be properly defended, is a proposition as to which no Englishman worthy of his birth can feel otherwise than practically anxious.

ART. VI.—1. *Autobiography of Henry Taylor, 1800–1875*. Two volumes, 8vo. London: 1885.

2. *The Works of Sir Henry Taylor*. Five volumes, post 8vo. London: 1883.

IN one department, at least, of English literature the supply is at present abundant and the public insatiable. Biography, the record of the lives of the last two generations, is the staple of the reading world. A large proportion of the more important works which claim our notice are biographical; and if posterity cares to know aught of the men and women who flourished in the nineteenth century, an inexhaustible mine of materials will be bequeathed to it by the sedulous researches or ingenuous confessions of our own times. In other respects, it may be said that English letters have fallen upon a dark, if not a sterile age. In spite of the prodigious fecundity of the press, neither England, nor indeed any other nation, can boast at the present time of any writer of first-rate eminence and European reputation, if we except those septuagenarian or octogenarian authors, some of whom we still rejoice to see amongst us, but whose labours and whose fame belong to the first half of this century rather than to the second. The poetic cycle which began with Burns and Cowper and included Coleridge, Scott, Wordsworth, Southey, Shelley, Keats, and Byron—the cycle of fiction which started from Sir Walter Scott and closed with Thackeray and George Eliot—the cycle of history which included Hallam, Milman, Grote, Macaulay, and Carlyle—were periods to which the present time affords no parallel. There is a vast deal of ingenious speculation and research, and a fair amount of good writing; but the fire of original genius burns low, and the present generation has produced little or nothing that will *live*. Those who have lived through the century, like the venerable author of the volume now before us, have shared the abundance of a great banquet, almost unconscious of the splendour of the feast. Those who follow them are content, not without curiosity and eagerness, to gather up the fragments, of which there are many baskets full. No greater homage could be paid to the memory of departed men of genius than the extreme avidity with which every detail of their lives, their characters, even of their secret correspondence, their domestic relations, and their thoughts, is ripped up (to use Lord Tennyson's expression) and ransacked for the amusement or the instruction of a less gifted

age. But in not a few instances this biographical passion, which adds something, as has been said, to the terrors of death, has led to the desecration of the dead and to the rifling of tombs, in which the secrets of the heart should lie in undisturbed repose.

Against such intrusions of impertinent biographers autobiography is the best resource. A man of reflection is the best judge of what it becomes him to relate of the incidents of his life, the formation of his character, and the execution of his works; and in the art of telling it he gives the fairest and fullest proof of his judgement and capacity. No one can supply from without, from conversation, from correspondence, from public actions, that knowledge of the finer influences of life and the intimate fibres of the heart and brain, which are of the essence of true biography. There are few such books, written in a perfectly sincere and ingenuous spirit, but those we possess are invaluable, and this is one of them.

We shall not attempt to follow Sir Henry Taylor in the detailed record of the incidents of his life. They have been related elsewhere in many notices, and our readers will do well to follow the simple narrative in his own pages. But the peculiarity of this book is that it has no events to relate—no occurrence which rises above the level of a domestic incident; yet the manner of relating these incidents, and the carefully noted influence of each of them on character and thought, are inexpressibly interesting, for although the incidents are common, the result has proved as uncommon as a high poetic faculty united to a singular depth of wisdom, and a well-compacted life. It is therefore essentially a study of character. Sir Henry Taylor has given us a picture not so much of his life as of his mind.

But his life has differed in all respects from the ordinary lives of Englishmen. Born in a secluded part of the north of England, he was entirely educated by his father and his stepmother, to whom he continued always to be devotedly attached, in a lonely border tower of the Marches. He was at no school and no university. He appears to have had no associates but his two brothers, who died young. His health was weak. His boyhood was spent under a cloud of domestic affliction, from the death of his mother, which occurred when he was an infant. He had no taste whatever for the athletic exercises and field-sports, which are the first passion of English youth. He neither shot nor hunted, nor danced, nor ran. Singularly enough, at thirteen he went

to sea on board the 'Elephant,' under Captain Austin; but if he had been a lazy boy at home, he was quite as lazy at sea; the set of 'abominable blackguards and bullies' amongst whom he was thrown disgusted him; maggoty biscuits and salt pork disagreed with him, and in a few months he obtained his discharge from the navy. This, then, was his first and last experience of what may be termed active life; he returned to his lonely home, and from that time his self-education proceeded by reading old and new English books, nestling in the hay-loft. His father was a recluse of 'an antique Roman type;' a good scholar, devoted to his books, but entirely addicted to obscurity and retirement, from which, by the way, he was once allured by a call to act as Secretary to the Royal Commission on the Poor Laws in 1831, when he rendered great services to the Commission, but soon threw up the appointment because his wife wanted him to return home.

The elder Mr. Taylor does not appear to have exercised much influence over his son during these critical years. The young poet, like Topsy, 'grewed,' without guidance or tending, and by the time he was twenty he had written a good many verses; in fact, he passed through the epidemic, absolutely universal in the year of grace 1821—the epidemic of Byronic enthusiasm. Which of us could have resisted it? Henry Taylor did not resist it, and he has expiated the heresy, if it was one, in dust and ashes throughout his later life. But he owed to it some of those moments of ecstacy and enthusiasm which are the glory and the joy of a poetic youth; when the imagination flames with delight; moments which none of the more sober triumphs of maturer years can surpass or equal. One of these passages he describes in charming language:—

'For dull, almost to disease, as my daily life was at Witton-le-Wear, there were three weeks of it on which I have always looked back as supremely delightful. In the summer of 1822 my father and step-mother went on a tour to see the Scotch lakes; for my father, notwithstanding his imperfect sight, had the most ardent admiration of picturesque beauty in nature that I have ever met with in any man, and my stepmother, in her degree, loved it also. They were absent for about three weeks. Now, to me, in those days, and indeed in later days also, there was something exciting in the sense of solitude—an absolute inspiration in an empty house. Generally, as I have said, my inebrieties were nocturnal only, and the day paid the penalty of the night's excess. But for these never-to-be-forgotten three weeks, all penalties were postponed, if not remitted; the lark took up the song from the nightingale, and my delights were prolonged, without

distinction of night or day, and with the intermission of but three or four hours of sleep begun after three in the morning.

‘It was midsummer weather. The house was dark and gloomy, an old square ivy-covered border tower with walls so thick that light and sunshine had their own difficulties. I remember that a sprig of ivy had worked its way inwards and was sprouting in a corner of the drawing-room; and writing in after years, when my father and step-mother had been from home, and had gone back to “what they call “their nest,” I said it reminded me of Wordsworth’s

“forsaken bird’s-nest filled with snow
Left in a bush of leafless eglantine.”

But the situation was picturesque, near the top of a steep hill which rose for about half a mile from the valley of the Wear. The river was crossed by a bridge nearly opposite; its farther bank was steep and thickly wooded towards the west; towards the east, where the bank was low, there was a wood or grove, through which a burn, called the Lynn, went its way to join the river; and farther eastward, at the summit of a green slope, stood an uninhabited castle, partly ancient, partly modern. - My habitual walk was down the hill, across the bridge, through the grove, crossing the Lynn by an old plank bridge, and up to the castle, where I paced backwards and forwards on the top of a sunk fence that imitated a moat. During these three wonderful weeks I took this walk in the middle of the summer’s nights, and then mounted by a narrow little staircase from my bedroom at the top of the tower to the flat leads which roofed it, and there walked backwards and forwards till the sun rose. All the day round I saw no one but the servants, except that I sometimes looked through a telescope (part of my naval outfit in 1814) from these leads at the goings on of a farmstead on a road which skirted our grounds at the farther end. Through this telescope I saw once a young daughter of the farmer rush into the arms of her brother, on his arrival after an absence, radiant with joy. I think this was the only phenomenon of human emotion which I had witnessed for three years, except one. That was when my stepmother, who was not in the habit of betraying her emotions as long as she could stand upon her feet, fell upon the floor on the receipt of a letter which told that a niece of hers (the daughter of a clergyman and granddaughter of an archbishop) had eloped with a married man.

‘These three weeks were, as I have said, a favourable time for writing verses; and the best of my juvenile poems, “The Cave of “Ceada,” was written then. The best was not bad—of its kind—nor without a certain sort of fervour and beauty; but it was merely built upon Byron. So far as temperament went, there was nothing wanting. It is this temperamental element which makes a poetical poet; it is this, combined with more than ordinary intelligence and thoughtfulness and an easy command of language and of salient and obvious melodies, which makes a popular poet; it is this, combined with intellectual and rhythmic gifts of the highest order and with wisdom, which makes a great poet.

‘Throughout youth and middle life, till health failed, and even after that, I had almost habitual accessions of this temperamental kind; but I was never more of a poet, as far as *this* goes, than when I wrote had or indifferent poetry; and I never felt the charm of poetry more deeply than when the poetry which charmed me was (though better executed) not of a higher order than that which I wrote myself.

“Oh many are the poets that are sown
By Nature; men endowed with highest gifts,
The vision and the faculty divine,
Yet wanting the accomplishment of verse.”

If many are these (of which I do not feel any positive assurance), certainly, in our days, many more are they who are poets by nature and temperament, and possessed also of the accomplishment of verse, but wanting in the highest gifts, “the vision and the faculty divine.” They are true poets so far forth; and some of them have their just and appropriate reward in popularity.’ (Vol. i. pp. 43–7.)

The life thus singularly begun continued under circumstances not less peculiar, without guides, without associates, except the two brothers of whom little is said, and as yet without a purpose. Most men who have to make their way in the world, being without independent means or patrimonial possessions, turn their thoughts to some profession; but no such object appears to have crossed Henry Taylor’s mind. His only aspiration was the desire of literary success; his only ideal the life poetic; and although, as we shall presently see, his own good fortune placed him on the road of official life and gave a practical application to his remarkable powers, yet the love of letters retained an undivided empire over his heart, and poetical fame continued to be the sole ambition of his life. When he was sixteen, and his two brothers somewhat older, the three lads went up to London, clerkships in some subordinate department of the Treasury having been obtained for two of them, whilst William, the third, was to study medicine. This first start ended ill. They all caught typhoid fever in a London lodging; the two elder brothers died of it; Henry recovered. But his storekeeper’s appointment was soon afterwards suppressed, and he returned to his tower, more solitary than ever, for several years.

At two-and-twenty he sent an article on Moore’s ‘Irish Melodies’ to the ‘Quarterly Review,’ which was accepted by Mr. Gifford, who appears to have detected with rare sagacity that a powerful mind lay behind the flippancy of his young contributor. At three-and-twenty he visited the Lake country, and made the acquaintance of Southey, whom he ranks,

and has ever ranked, very high amongst his literary contemporaries. Southey certainly conceived himself to have achieved a position not inferior to any of that brilliant constellation: his learning, his industry, his excellent style, and even some passages of his poems are remembered with honour; yet where is the reputation of Southey now? He is an obliterated star. But we doubt not that in 1823 he appeared to a literary aspirant at the very zenith of his career, and in some verses written at the time the young poet declares that

‘Not to books alone
The harvest of those years was gathered in;
For living minds there were to which my own
Did in its aspirations then begin,
As was its right by birth, to be akin.’

This is not the only passage in which Sir Henry Taylor, not only in youth but in age, claims with ingenuous frankness to rank with the first intellectual powers of his age and country. We have no doubt of his sincerity, but it rests not with any man, or even with the contemporaries of any man, to determine his true rank and intellectual value. ‘*Ai posteri,*’ as Manzoni said of Napoleon, ‘*l’ardua sentenza!*’

Soon afterwards Henry Taylor again repaired to London, apparently with no other object than to devote himself to literature, a profession then much less accessible and lucrative than it has since become. But here an astonishing piece of good fortune awaited him. Within three months of his arrival in the capital, by one of those strokes of a fairy’s wand which occur in story-books, he found himself appointed to a clerkship in the Colonial Office, with a moderate salary, shortly to be increased, a definite employment, and a provision for life. The good fairy in this instance was our much-valued friend the late Sir Henry Holland, who was never happier than when he could exert his large social influence to do an act of kindness. In this instance he did more than an act of kindness, for he not only provided a career to a young man of merit, but he secured to the State services of no mean value, which lasted for half a century. To Taylor himself the benefit was enormous, for it not only gave him a position in life, but it supplied definite objects and duties of high interest, valuable to all men, but most valuable to those whose meditative and poetical temperament might otherwise lose them in the clouds.

To men who are averse to notoriety and indifferent to the common prizes of ambition, few positions in life are more

valuable than a confidential appointment in one of the great offices of state. These civil servants work the machinery of government; they are conversant with its secret action; they share its influence and its power, and they are brought into close connexion with the leading statesmen of the day. To them politics are not a noisy contest, waged for party purposes, but a science and an art, directed to the public good. Fifty years ago, more than at present, the civil servants in the great offices formed a somewhat close corporation, intimately connected by social ties. The system of admission to the civil service by competitive examination has broken these ties, and they no longer exist. But it would be difficult for any minister to command the services of abler assistants than the Colonial Secretary who had at his elbow for many years such men as James Stephen, James Spedding, Frederic Rogers, Frederic Elliot, and Henry Taylor. No office in Downing Street was more powerfully manned than the Colonial Department of that day. The ability of Henry Taylor appears to have been promptly recognised by Lord Bathurst (then Colonial Secretary of State), notwithstanding the young clerk's total inexperience of public affairs. He plunged into them at once, drew up a paper for the Cabinet, prepared materials for a speech of Mr. Canning, and drafted important despatches for the minister. At that time the most critical questions of colonial policy lay in the West Indies, which have since collapsed into comparative insignificance. Australia was not; the troubles in Canada had not begun; even South Africa was tranquil. But in all the slave-holding colonies of British America the condition, the welfare, and the ultimate emancipation of the negroes were in agitation, and were the subject of passionate conflicts between the West India interest and the philanthropic party both abroad and at home. This was the peculiar department in which it fell to the lot of Henry Taylor to serve. None required more judgment, or a more complete absence of party spirit. In the following passage he gives his own account of the part he bore in this great controversy:—

‘In 1824 the Government of Lord Liverpool had taken up a position of mediator between the saints and the planters; finding an escape for themselves from the dilemma of the moment by one of those compromises in which an endeavour is made to reconcile oppugnant principles and implacable opponents. The slaves were not to be enfranchised, but their condition was to be “meliorated,” as the word went. A model code was devised according to which the lash was to be taken out of the hands of the driver, punishments were to be inflicted only under

the authority of stipendiary magistrates, the hours of labour were to be limited, the allowances of food were to be regulated, husbands and wives and their children were not to be sold apart, and protectors were to be appointed who were to watch over the enforcement of the code and make half-yearly reports on all matters affecting the welfare of the slaves. The saints accepted the measure as all they could get for the moment, profoundly convinced, however, that so long as slaves were slaves, they must continue to be the victims of cruelty and wrong; whilst the planters, on the other hand, knew well enough that, whether or not negroes would be induced to work for wages if freed (which they absolutely refused to believe), nothing short of the lash in the hand of the driver would make them work as slaves.

‘In the West Indian Colonies, with few exceptions, all legislative authority, and, along with the power of granting or withholding supplies, almost all executive authority was in the hands of the planters. If the Assemblies refused to enact the “meliorating” code, there was no power in the Crown to coerce them. We tried everything. Many a conciliatory despatch was written; not a single Assembly was conciliated. Many were the minatory despatches that followed; and threats were found equally unavailing. The controversy went on year after year; the Assemblies raged abroad; the saints wailed and howled at home; the Crown maintained an outward aspect of moderation: “Not so, my “sons, not so!” But in the Colonial Office we knew what we were about. We had established protectors of slaves in the few colonies in which we had legislative power; they made their half-yearly reports in which every outrage and enormity perpetrated on the slaves was duly detailed, with the usual result of trials and acquittals by colonial juries, and perhaps a banquet given by the principal colonists in honour of the offenders; we wrote despatches in answer, careful and cautious in their tone, but distinctly marking each atrocity, and bringing its salient points into the light; we laid the reports and despatches before Parliament as fast as they were received and written; Zachary Macaulay forthwith transferred them to the pages of his “Monthly Anti-Slavery Reporter,” by which they were circulated far and wide through the country; the howlings and wailings of the saints were seen to be supported by unquestionable facts officially authenticated; the cry of the country for the abolition of slavery waxed louder every year; strange rumours reached the ears of the negroes; they became excited and disturbed, imagining that the King had given them their freedom, and that the fact and the freedom were kept from them by their owners; there was plotting and conspiracy; and at length came the insurrection of 1831 in Jamaica; in which, of the negroes some hundreds lost their lives, of the whites not one.

‘This terrible event, with all its horrors and cruelties, its military slaughters and its many murders by flogging, though failing of its object as a direct means, was indirectly a death-blow to slavery. The reform of Parliament was almost simultaneous with it, and might have been sufficient of itself. Under the operation of both, the only questions that remained were, whether it was to be effected abruptly and at once, or through some transitional process, and whether with or without com-

pensation to the planters. James Stephen, who, under the title of Counsel to the Colonial Department, had, for some years, more than any other man, ruled the Colonial Empire, was now prepared to go all lengths with his uncle, Mr. Wilberforce, and the Anti-Slavery party; and simple and immediate emancipation was what they desired.

From the first years in which I had been called upon to consider the question, I had been resolute for emancipation; but I had not been satisfied, nor at that time was Stephen or anyone else, that emancipation ought to be total and immediate. In a letter to Edward Villiers, of April, 1826, I adverted to the only example in existence of sudden emancipation, that given by the French in St. Domingo, where massacres, more frightful even than those of La Vendée, were succeeded by the ferocious tyranny of Christophe, and by the "Code Henri," which provided that any man found during prescribed hours of the day off the land assigned to him to cultivate, should be shot by the police; and I referred to the compulsory manumission clause of the meliorating Order in Council, as contended for in Lord Bathurst's despatches, for an indication of the principle on which gradual emancipation might be combined with indemnity to the owners. In 1831, I was still unprepared for immediate emancipation; but I thought that I could see my way to the immediate commencement of a self-accelerating process of emancipation. It was determined on all hands that I was to "take the initiative and draw out a scheme of proceeding which might form the "basis of discussion," first in the Colonial Office, and, if approved there, in the Cabinet.

Taylor proposed a plan of gradual emancipation to the Cabinet under the administration of Lord Grey, which was opposed by Lord Howick (who was then Under-Secretary in the Colonial Department) and Lord Brougham; and although he lost the official importance he had acquired under the rule of Mr. Stanley, the measure ultimately passed by that minister was in great measure prepared by Stephen and himself.

"The Abolition Act which was passed provided for what was called an apprenticeship to last for six years; and on that total emancipation was to follow; and it provided also for a grant of twenty millions to compensate the slaveowners. In writing about the measure I said that if it should succeed, its success would be owing to the "circumstance of Stephen's putting his own designs into enactments and Mr. Stanley's "into a preamble. It is owing to this circumstance, indeed," I added, "as far as I can judge, that any slavery measure whatever was passed "in the late session; for after the wild plunge with which Stanley "entered upon the subject, I am persuaded that he would have been "unable to carry through a measure if Stephen had not held himself "bound in duty to the cause to disencumber him, so far as was then "possible, of his own schemes, and construct a measure that with all its "faults might have a chance of success. The personal history of the "Slavery Bill is, in truth, a remarkable part of the whole business.

'There have been many misbegotten measures before it which have brought upon their putative parents reproaches not otherwise due to them than as having undertaken tasks it was impossible that they could perform with their own hands, and many measures also which have reflected honour on those to whom mighty little of the merit of them was really due; but I doubt if a great measure was ever brought into the world by a Minister of the Crown of which one could say that the responsibility for all that was evil in it had been so undividedly as well as wantonly and perversely incurred, and the credit for what was good so surreptitiously obtained. And Stephen, after all that he has done for Stanley,—after having his services haughtily repudiated in the first instance, solicited when the emergency came, and profited by to the utmost extent without compunction or moderation,—is now treated with supreme indifference and neglect, as if there was nothing to be ashamed of, nothing to be grateful for, and as if nothing were to be observed in him which should entitle him to respect.'" (Vol. i. pp. 134, 135.)

Before we quit this part of the subject, it deserves remark that Taylor and his friends had little faith in colonial self-government, or in the attachment of the colonies to the mother country. The more enlarged principles of colonial policy which have since prevailed were advocated by men like Charles Buller, who were the avowed opponents of the bureaucracy. After negro emancipation Taylor declared

'that assuming the objects of the Government to be necessary to the establishment of the liberty and promotion of the industry of the negroes, and that the habits and prejudices, if not the interests of the planters, are strongly opposed to them, then the only method of accomplishing them effectually and completely, and the best method as regards irritation and discontent, will be by exerting at once and conclusively, a power which shall overrule all opposition and set the question at rest. The persuasory and recommendatory process may appear to be the more conciliatory at first; but I am convinced that the appearance is fallacious. The West Indian legislatures have neither the will nor the skill to make such laws as you want made; and they cannot be converted on the point of willingness, and they will not be instructed.'

And consistently with this opinion he would willingly have extinguished all the West Indian Assemblies, holding them to be unfitted for a really representative system. To some extent this view was adopted by the Cabinet. The Jamaica Bill of 1839 was introduced, defeated, and the Government thrown out upon it. In the opinion of Sir Henry Taylor this was an unwise and disastrous event. In 1866 the more resolute policy prevailed, which he had recommended in 1839, but in the meantime great evils had occurred.

'The fate of the measure is instructive, as showing the occasional

effect of our system of party government upon the welfare of our colonial dependencies. Sir Robert Peel and his party threw out the Government (to very little purpose, as it proved, for Sir Robert met with what he considered an insuperable difficulty in forming another); and the well-being of about a million negroes was sacrificed for a term of about six-and-twenty years. Corruption, malversation, waste, and ruin went on in Jamaica and elsewhere. No provision was made for the due administration of justice or an efficient police; none for securing to the negro the fruits of his industry, if industrious; none for his education; none for saving him from the consequences of vagrancy and squatting on unoccupied lands, in barbarous solitudes, when driven from the plantations by the conduct of the planters: the docile and grateful generation of negroes that had worshipped God and the missionaries passed away; new and inferior missionaries had to beg their bread from flocks which gave them a beggarly return, and indeed regarded them as little better than beggars; wild black missionaries broke into the fold, and, under the name of revivalists, led roving multitudes of negroes into an extravagance of debauchery compared with which their ordinary condition of concubinage was decent and respectable; roving gangs of another kind lived by plundering the provision grounds of their fellows, who had no resource but to rove and plunder in their turn; political agitators of the mixed blood arose and pointed to Hayti; plots were formed for slaughtering the planters and taking possession of the plantations; companies of negroes were secretly embodied and drilled under black leaders in the remote and mountainous districts; and at length, in October 1865, the blow was struck in St. Thomas-in-the-East which was designed to raise the whole black population of Jamaica in revolt and exterminate the whites. Twenty-six magistrates and others, assembled with other persons in sessions, saw large bodies of the negroes march down upon them in military array, and having no means of defence, eighteen were killed in cold blood, and thirty-one wounded, of whom I think some died of their wounds. It so happened that Mr. Eyre, the Governor of the colony, though a civilian, was a man with a military faculty; and by the exercise of his gifts of this kind with military promptitude and decision, he contrived to cut off the communication of the rebels with their friends in the northern and western districts, and very speedily to crush them within their own.

'The negro population throughout the colony was intimidated, and peace was restored. But the Assembly which had been preserved in 1839 for twenty-six years more of misrule, was frightened into its senses at the state of things it had brought to pass, and voluntarily put an end to its existence.' (Vol. i. pp. 262-4.)

The life of Sir Henry Taylor has been spent in an extremely contracted circle, but this circle, narrow as it was, proved to be a focus of culture and high feeling. His health, never robust, and aggravated in later years by spasmodic asthma, confined him to his house, and unfitted him for the turmoil of London society. He complains, perhaps from an

excess of self-consciousness, of an inaptitude to please, which other people did not discover. Above all the tenor of his mind was not discursive, but concentrated. The exquisite lines in which he described the even tenor of the existence of his friend Edward Villiers may not inaptly be applied to himself:—

‘His life was private; safely led, aloof
From the loud world—which yet he understood
Largely and justly, as no worldling could.
For he by privilege of his nature proof
Against false glitters, from beneath the roof
Of privacy, as from a cave, surveyed
With steadfast eye, its flashing light and shade,
And wisely judged for evil and for good.’

Hence he sought and found the sympathies of his life in the domestic circle and in chosen intimacies, without much caring for what lay beyond them. His colleagues in the Colonial Office formed, as we have already indicated, such a society; and soon after his arrival in London he was thrown into the company of a set of men, less congenial perhaps to the bent of his own mind, but all singularly distinguished in after life—Charles Austin, John Mill, Edward Strutt, John Romilly, and Charles Villiers.

The sketches of these early associates are extremely felicitous. That of John Mill especially deserves to be quoted:—

‘John Mill was the most severely single-minded of the set. He was of an impassioned nature, but I should conjecture, though I do not *know*, that in his earliest youth the passion of his nature had not found a free and unobstructed course through the affections, and had got a good deal pent up in his intellect; in which, however large (and amongst the *scientific* intellects of his time I hardly know where to look for a larger), it was but as an eagle in an aviary. The result was that his political philosophy, cold as was the creed and hard the forms and discipline, caught fire; and whilst working, as in duty bound, through dry and rigorous processes of induction, was at heart something in the nature of political fanaticism. He was pure-hearted—I was going to say conscientious—but at that time he seemed so naturally and necessarily good, and so inflexible, that one hardly thought of him as having occasion for a conscience, or as a man with whom any question could arise for reference to that tribunal. But his absorption in abstract operations of the intellect, his latent ardours, and his absolute simplicity of heart, were hardly, perhaps, compatible with knowledge of men and women, and with wisdom in living his life. His manners were plain, neither graceful nor awkward; his features refined and regular; the eyes small relatively to the scale of the face, the jaw large, the nose straight and finely shaped, the lips thin and compressed,

the forehead and head capacious; and both face and body seemed to represent outwardly the inflexibility of the inner man. He shook hands with you from the shoulder. Though for the most part painfully grave, he was as sensible as anybody to Charles Austin's or Charles Villiers's sallies of wit, and his strong and well-built body would heave for a few moments with half-uttered laughter. He took his share in conversation, and talked, ably and well of course, but with such scrupulous solicitude to think exactly what he should and say exactly what he thought, that he spoke with an appearance of effort and as if with an impediment of the mind. His ambition—so far as he had any—his ardent desire rather, for I doubt if he had much feeling about himself in the matter—was to impress his opinions on mankind and promote the cause of political science. His works on logic and political economy have now been for many years of the highest authority amongst the learned, and his writings on political philosophy are regarded, even by those who most differ from them, as the aberrations of a powerful and admirable intellect. He has just (1865) furnished the first example of a man sought out and summoned by a large constituency to represent them in the House of Commons, without any proposal or desire of his own to do so, partly on account of his political opinions no doubt, but chiefly on the ground of his eminence as a political philosopher. His seat for Westminster, though not in itself what he would have sought and pursued, is the result and indication of what he did seek and pursue—a wide-spread influence over the minds of men in his day and generation: and he, too, therefore, has got what he desired.' (Vol. i. pp. 78–80.)

Taylor had not the gift of oratory which some of these men possessed, and he repudiated the utilitarian doctrines which formed the basis of their political and philosophical creed. By one of the contrasts in which his life abounds, he stood, as it were, between the opposite poles of Bentham on the one hand, and of Wordsworth and Southey on the other. Needless to say that all his sympathies, both as a poet and a man, were with the latter.

About this time (1827) he published his first play, 'Isaac Comnenus,' with but little success. Yet this work, like all the productions of his pen, was the result of most careful and deliberate workmanship. The first two acts were written in two months—the other in as many years, with another year of revision.

The subject of the drama is not attractive, for no art can give life to the dull shadows of the Lower Empire, but the language of the characters has the same grave measured wisdom, which belongs to all Taylor's creations. He is the most reflective and sententious of poets and dramatists. Not a line escapes him which is not fraught with meaning. He has none of that lyrical inspiration which springs from

the earth, like Shelley's lark, and soars on eager and exulting wings to the light. He has none of the burning passion of Manfred or Childe Harold. He rejects the gorgeous and abundant imagery which crowds the verse of Keats, and sometimes obscures his meaning. Many poets have a more vivid imagination; some a more genial vein of sentiment; but none a deeper current of reflection, expressed in singularly elaborate and accurate language. Sir Henry Taylor's style is severe, for his object is to convey and embody thought. Hence his works were slowly evolved and executed: four or five years to 'Isaac Comnenus,' six to 'Philip van Artevelde,' four to 'Edwin the Fair.' No wonder that a lightheaded public, more ready to be amused than instructed, did not at once acknowledge the real value and eloquence of sentiments expressed in language so apt and so discriminative, and that his poems have never attained the popularity which has been accorded to some of his contemporaries. The fault may have been as much in the public as in the poet. But he had chosen his own path and knew whither it led. In his own graceful language:—

'It may be folly—they are few
Who think it so—to laugh or blame,
But single sympathies to me
Are more than fame.
The glen and not the mountain-top
I love, and though its date be brief,
I snatch the rose you send, and drop
The laurel leaf.'

But the laurel leaf was not always wanting. 'Philip van Artevelde,' published in 1834, had a far stronger human interest, and at once raised its author to celebrity. It has retained for fifty years a marked preference over Taylor's other works, and undoubtedly ranks amongst the best dramatic poems of this century. It is not in truth a tragedy, but rather, as the author himself remarks, 'an historical romance cast in a dramatic and rhythmical form.' In some respects, however, we think this preference does scant justice to some of his later productions. 'St. Clement's Eve' is a more complete drama; the action more concentrated and rapid, the incidents more striking, and the character of Yolande at least as pure and noble as that of Adriana herself. In all these plays there is the same tone of meditative philosophy, more appropriate to the author than to the personages he represents. In different dresses and occasions the same personage reappears, and one is

tempted to believe that after all, be he Philip or Leolf, it is Henry Taylor we see in disguise. The poetry of reflection necessarily bears the stamp of a mind working on its own materials, and coloured by its own thoughts. The inimitable and unapproachable excellence of the greatest of dramatic writers consists in this: that every character he calls into life is complete without the slightest indication of his own.

Sir Henry Taylor's whole theory of poetic art may be learned not only from his own poems, but from his admirable essays. Indeed, the poems and the essays are indissolubly blended—they are streams from the same source. To him the poetry of this country is 'the chief storehouse 'of civil wisdom;' the Baconian interpreter of nature:

'Subservient to moral purposes,
Auxiliar to divine.'

His verse is deeply tinged with this philosophic spirit; in his prose the same spirit reigns, mingled with something of poetic feeling, as subtle as the scent of violets. His own disposition and the habits of his life have rendered him a fervent admirer and follower of those who stood nearest to himself in genius and affection. A larger experience of the world might have given him more expanded and indulgent tastes. The love of music, a taste for all the forms of plastic art, the great spectacle of the treasures and splendours of time and of the world, a passionate admiration of nature in all her changes, enlarge and glorify the mind of man; but to these things he appears to have remained, for the most part, unconsciously indifferent. His wealth of thought and imagery lay stored in the treasure-house of his own mind. It is the tendency of minds so self-contained to view with microscopical precision and interest the objects immediately surrounding them, and to estimate as the very highest whatever is nearest to themselves. Thus the sense of the proportion and relative value of things is sometimes lost, for, however far our horizon may extend, there lies an ocean of infinity beyond it. The poet, says Sir Henry Taylor himself in his 'Essay on the Life Poetic,' which it is interesting to compare with his personal experience—

'The poet should be widely as well as keenly observant, and though self-observant, not too much so. For that poetic vision which is the vision of the introverted eye alone has but a narrow scope; and observation comes of action, and most of that action which is the most responsible. And if it be true that a "man's mind is sometimes wont "to tell him more than seven watchmen that sit above in a high

"tower," it is also true that that man will hear most of all who hearkens to his own mind and to the seven watchmen besides, whilst what he hears will turn to knowledge, and will be fixed, amplified, and defined in proportion as there are deeds and consequences to follow, and sweet or bitter fruits.*

Sir Henry Taylor has owed much of the happiness of his life to noble friendships. The ties which united him to Hyde and Edward Villiers neither death nor time could unbind. But he owes most to the friendships of women. To him the society of any woman has been more attractive than the society of any man. His step-mother, his cousin Miss Fenwick, Lady Taunton, Lady Hislop, Lady Minto, Lady Hatherton, and many other distinguished Englishwomen, were at various periods of his life his principal correspondents, and their benign influence converged and centred in his domestic life. We say 'distinguished Englishwomen,' because in no other country that we know of can such intimacies spring up entirely without fear and without reproach; and they gave to Sir Henry Taylor's poems that lofty type of womanhood which reappears in each of them. Adriana, Rosalba, Yolande, Elgiva, have all that stately tenderness which bends in earnest affection to those they love, without the touch of any sensual passion. They have the warmth of love without its flame. Like some of the streams of southern England they are deep and clear because they are always pure.

Time passed; the youthful coterie was dispersed by circumstances:—

'The little group of doctrinaires had broken up, as such groups of the young are wont to do when the maturer men go forth upon their several paths and become occupied and absorbed in professions or in political life, or when they marry themselves away. The death of Hyde Villiers would probably have dissolved the group, had it not been, as I rather think it was, dispersed at an earlier date. No more of breakfasts prolonged from ten o'clock to three by the charm of Charles Austin's bold and buoyant vivacities, set off by the gentle and thoughtful precision of John Romilly, the searching insights of John Mill, the steady and sterling sense of Edward Strutt, the gibes and mockeries of Charles Villiers, and the almost feminine grace combined with the masculine intellect of Hyde. These were at an end. And in Kent House, with all its attractions, its gaiety and wit, my place knew me no more. It was after going past it one evening that I wrote the lines in "*Van Artevelde*," beginning—

* 'Essay on the Life Poetic,' Sir H. Taylor's Works, vol. iv. p. 118.

“There is a gate in Ghent—I passed beside it—
A threshold there, worn of my frequent feet,
Which I shall cross no more.”

And no doubt much of what had brightened my life had been taken out of it.’ (Vol. i. pp. 159–60.)

Neither literary success nor official promotion could altogether compensate for some such disappointments: but these at least were not wanting. ‘Philip van Artevelde’ had opened to Taylor the best society in London, but, oddly enough, he found Lansdowne House too literary, and Holland House (or rather Lady Holland) too masterful. Perhaps he was not aware that, although that society collected men of the highest distinction and ability, there was in it singularly little formal recognition of genius. A man might live there as on the top of a mountain, without being reminded that life in those houses was a good deal above the level of the sea. In his own office Taylor’s merits were fully recognised. Lord Aberdeen said he was ashamed to see him in the position of a clerk; and the Under-Secretaryship of State was eventually offered him, which he declined. He had the good sense to see that ‘subordination comes more easily to men—at least to gentlemen—than the exercise of authority,’ and that in fact everybody is subordinate to the circumstances of his life.

‘Acting according to this view, when Greville told me in January, 1835, that “if the present Government were to subsist for a while, they would wish to place me in some more prominent position,” a letter to my mother says:—

“I gave him to understand that I did not wish to be placed in any situation which would imply more activity than I am called upon to exercise where I am; and, indeed, it would be difficult for the Government, in these days of no sinecures, to better my condition in my own estimation.”

‘And looking back upon my life over an interval of forty years, if political office was in contemplation, I cannot think that I was wrong. Strong health and an independent fortune would have made more of a doubt; but even with those elements to vary the question, I think the answer should have been the same. I had no strong political opinions, nor had I any special aptitude for political life; and I have no reason to suppose that any place I might have occupied in it has not been better filled by others. Even had it been otherwise, every year of many years has detracted from the value of individual mind and character in a political career, whilst adding to the demand for co-operation, compromise, and subserviency to popular impulse or opinion; and the mere capable and flexible tactician—the Lord Palmerston of the day—could hold his ground as well as the man of large intellect and devoted patriotism—the man who, in this month of

April, 1873, has just remounted to his uncertain seat, after having been upset into the ditch upon a question of third-rate importance.

‘With every year, moreover, the labours and troubles and trials of political life have increased and multiplied; and what Sir Philip Sidney says to Lord Brooke in Landor’s “Imaginary Conversation,” if true of other times, is more eminently true of these:—

“How many who have abandoned for public life the studies of philosophy and poetry may be compared to brooks and rivers which, in the beginning of their course, have assuaged our thirst and have invited us to tranquillity by their bright resemblance of it, and which afterwards partake the nature of that vast body whereinto they run—its dreariness, its bitterness, its foam, its storms, its everlasting noise and commotion!”’

The summer of 1839 brought Taylor into a haven of life by his marriage with the youngest daughter of Mr. Spring Rice, after some previous moments of perplexity and doubt which he has related with his usual candour; and certainly if this was the end of a romance, it has proved an uncommonly happy one. The family of Lord Monteagle was entirely congenial to the poet. Their flashes of Irish wit and gaiety played like summer lightning about his self-contained intellect, and touched all the kindly springs of his nature.

To this connexion was added the society of one house which combined many attractions. Lady Harriet Baring loved to surround herself with men of high intellectual power and originality; her hospitality to them was inexhaustible; intolerant as she was of many things, and of a somewhat harsh and wayward nature herself, she was tolerant of all their eccentricities; she extended her kindness even to their children, if they had any; and she made the Grange almost a home to the family of Taylor, and to Carlyle, and to the Brookfields. Taylor says, ‘With Lady Ashburton’s death my social life may be said to have come to an end. On looking back to it, I think all that was worth having in it came to me through her.’ The sketch he has given us of a large party at the Grange reminds us of the company in one of the late Mr. Peacock’s novels—‘Headlong Hall’—all sharp, clever, unconventional people, thinking as they pleased, and saying what they thought, with small regard to consequences. The mistress of the house herself had wit and smartness enough to keep her menagerie in order, though some of the creatures in it were recently caught and tamed, and her husband, afterwards Lord Ashburton, was a model of amiable and refined courtesy. But we are not sorry that Sir H. Taylor winds up his list of these wits and cynics with a word in memory of Brookfield: ‘A

‘man of many moods, and yet, perhaps, the most invariably agreeable of us all, and certainly the most felicitous in adapting himself to every occasion, and every man, woman, and child, from the old card-playing dowager to the baby in arms, and the nurse, and the nursery-maid.’

Amongst the men of letters who figured at the Grange, the most remarkable, though certainly not the most agreeable, was Thomas Carlyle. We have heard a good deal of late of the pangs which these visits inflicted on his wife; but her jealousy, if jealousy it was, must for many reasons have been altogether fantastical and imaginary. With Carlyle Sir H. Taylor claims a very intimate and most friendly acquaintance, and certainly his portrait of his friend is one of the most striking passages in this book. In fact, Sir H. Taylor had known Carlyle in London long before they met at the Grange. He had said of him long ago that ‘he was a Puritan who had lost his creed’—a witticism which he has not repeated in this book. He thought his character honest, but he perceived that the reality and truth of his opinions were in an inverse ratio to the violence with which he asserted them. The wonder is that a man uttering language so contradictory and sometimes so extravagant should have been accepted by the public in the guise of a prophet. That Sir Henry Taylor calls ‘the human paradox of the period,’ and he reasons thus upon it:—

‘But then it may be asked, how are we to reconcile the undoubted sincerity of the man with the questionable reality of the opinions? And it is the solution of this problem which, to my apprehension, discloses the peculiar constitution of Carlyle’s mind.

‘He is impatient of the slow process by which most thoughtful men arrive at a conclusion. His own mind is not logical; and, whilst other eminent writers of his generation have had perhaps too much reverence for logic, he has had too little. With infinite industry in searching out historical facts, his way of coming by political doctrines is sudden and precipitate. What can be known by insight without conscious reasoning, or at least without self-questioning operations of the reason, he knows well, and can flash upon us with words which are almost like the “word which Isaiah the son of Amoz saw.” But when he deals with what is not so to be known, being intolerant of lawful courses, and yet not content with a negative, or passive, or neutral position, he snatches his opinions, and holds them, as men commonly do hold what they have snatched, tenaciously for the moment, but not securely. And thence comes the sort of unreality of opinion which I have ventured to impute to the most faithful and true-hearted of mankind.

‘An unlimited freedom of speech is permitted to his friends, and I remember, when some wild sentiments escaped him long ago, telling him that he was an excellent man in all the relations of life, but that

he did not know the difference between right and wrong. And if such casualties of conversation were to be accepted as an exposition of his moral mind, anyone might suppose that these luminous shafts of his came out of the blackness of darkness.

‘Perhaps, too, he is a little dazzled by the reflex of his wild fire, and feels for a moment that what is so bright must needs show forth what is true; not recognising the fact that most truths are as dull as they are precious; simply because in the course of ages they have worked their way to the exalted, but not interesting, position of truisms.’ (Vol. i. pp. 326, 327.)

The same judgement of this strange man, so fascinating to some of his contemporaries, and so repulsive to others, was expressed at the time by Sir Henry Taylor in some of his letters.

“We have had Carlyle here all the time,—a longer time than I have hitherto seen him for. His conversation is as bright as ever, and as striking in its imaginative effects. But his mind seems utterly incapable of coming to any conclusion about anything; and if he says something that seems for the moment direct, as well as forcible, in the way of an opinion, it is hardly out of his mouth before he says something else that breaks it in pieces. He can see nothing but the chaos of his own mind reflected in the universe. Guidance, therefore, there is none to be got from him; nor any illumination, save that of storm-lights. But I suppose one cannot see anything so rich and strange as his mind is without gaining by it in some unconscious way, as well as finding pleasure and pain in it. It is fruitful of both.”

‘And I wrote in the same sense to my mother and to Aubrey de Vere. To her:—“The society of the house is gay and pleasant, divers visitors coming and going and some abiding. The only one you have any knowledge of is Carlyle, than whom none is more interesting—a striking element of the wild and grotesque to mix up with the more gay and graceful material of a fashionable set.”

‘To Aubrey:—“As to the rest of the people we have had at Alverstoke, some of them were agreeable, but none interesting except Carlyle, who from time to time threw his blue lights across the conversation. Strange and brilliant he was as ever, but more than ever adrift in his opinions, if opinions he could be said to have; for they darted about like the monsters of the solar microscope, perpetually devouring each other.”

‘I did not mean to imply, of course, that he had not, what he has made known to all the world that he had in a superlative degree, divers rooted predilections and unchangeable aversions. Both are strong in him; whether equally strong, it is not easy to say. There have been eminent men of all ages who have combined in different measures and proportions the attributes of idolater and iconoclast. They are undoubtedly combined in Carlyle; the former perhaps predominating in his writings, the latter in his conversation. What was unaccountable was that such a man should have chosen as the object of his idolatry, “iste stultorum magister”—Success. Long before his

life of Cromwell came out, I heard him insisting in conversation upon the fact that Cromwell had been throughout his career invariably successful; and having with much satisfaction traced the long line of his successes from the beginning to the end, he added, "it is true they got him out of his grave at the Restoration, and they stuck his head up over the gate at Tyburn, but not till he had quite done with it."

His powers of invective and disparagement, on the other hand, are exercised in conversation sometimes in a manifest spirit of contradiction and generally with an infusion of humour, giving them at one time the character of a passage of arms in a tournament or sham fight, at another that of a grotesque dance of mummers; so that, forcible as they often are, they are not serious enough to give offence.

He delights in knocking over any pageantry of another man's setting up. One evening at the Grange a party of gentlemen, returning from a walk in the dusk, had seen a magnificent meteor, one which filled a place in the newspapers for some days afterwards. They described what they had beheld in glowing colours and with much enthusiasm. Carlyle, having heard them in silence to the end, gave his view of the phenomenon:—

"Aye, some sulphuretted hydrogen, I suppose, or some rubbish of that kind."

These volumes abound in sketches of character equally just and felicitous, and in anecdotes related not without a certain quaint humour. Sir Henry Taylor recommends the young poet in one of his essays to confine his reading chiefly to the English literature of the seventeenth century, which he conceives to be the purest and noblest in our language. Having doubtless adhered in his own person to this precept, he has acquired from it a certain archaism of style, which in our days is a form of originality. 'Style,' it was said long ago, 'is the man,' but the style of the age we live in is the temper of that age, and he who deliberately writes in the style of another age is not speaking to his contemporaries in precisely their own language. We agree with his eloquent defence of the English prose of the seventeenth century, and we can admire the elaborate sentences of Bacon, Milton, Jeremy Taylor, and Barrow, in spite of their redundancy and profusion; but we should as soon think of borrowing their cloaks and trunk-hose as of proposing them as models for imitation. Indeed, it is impossible to depart widely from the conventional forms either of dress or language in the time we live in, without falling into the snares of affectation.

It is curious to note here and there in these volumes the accidental encounter of the man of contemplation with an incident of society, however trifling. The contrast produces a little effervescence. Thus, when Sir Henry is honoured by

the University with a D.C.L. degree, he muses over the gravities of the ensuing dinner and the gaieties of the commemoration week, arriving at the admirable conclusion that what is meant to be light should be short. That judicious opinion decides us to conclude this article, but before we drop the curtain we must quote one amusing passage between Lord Palmerston and Professor Wheatstone, the man who has revolutionised the world by his electric wires and cables, but who never could see, in his lifetime, that the topic might become a little wearisome.

‘The encounter which amused me most occurred at an evening party at the Vice-Chancellor’s. Lord Palmerston was one of the eminent men who had received his degree in the morning; and, standing at a little distance, I watched him as he listened to a somewhat prolonged exposition by Professor Wheatstone of certain new devices he had been busied with for the application of telegraphy. The man of science was slow, the man of the world *seemed* attentive; the man of science was copious, the man of the world let nothing escape him; the man of science unfolded the anticipated results—another and another, the man of the world listened with all his ears: and I was saying to myself, “His patience is exemplary, but will it last for ever?” when I heard the issue:—“God bless my soul, you don’t say so! I *must* get you to tell that to the Lord Chancellor.” And the man of the world took the man of science to another part of the room, hooked him on to Lord Westbury, and bounded away like a horse let loose in a pasture.’ (Vol. ii. pp. 218, 219.)

ART. VII.—*The Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Livery Companies of the City of London.*
5 vols. London: 1884.

THE Blue Book of a Royal Commission is often the burial-ground of a question. To appoint such a body is almost to confess that it is one which does not require to be settled. The recommendations are a nine days’ wonder, form a text for a few articles, and are then forgotten. If a better fate be in store for the five volumes, containing more than three thousand pages, which embody the results of the enquiry of Lord Derby and his eleven colleagues into the City Livery Companies, it will be through history declining to repeat itself. It is some time since Lord John Russell declared that Municipal Reform should not stop short at Temple Bar, but, though Temple Bar has been removed, the City of London has not been reformed. The Municipal Commission of 1834 and the City of London Commission of 1855 made

some timid and inconsistent recommendations. Mr. Mill and Lord Elcho introduced more ambitious bills; and Sir William Harcourt last session brought in a Government measure. Yet the Municipality, half shire, half city, is much what it was in Tudor or even Plantagenet times. As to the famous Companies, which once regulated its trades and manufactures, and whose gay liveries contributed to the brilliancy of its mediæval pageants, the Municipal Commission of 1834 reported not very favourably on their constitution; but, during the fifty years which have since passed, no proposal with respect to them has been laid before the House of Commons. The City of London, rich in traditions and memories, bears a charmed life, and the Companies, which are the almoners of its charities and the hosts at its banquets, partake of its invulnerability.

There can be no doubt, however, that the report, or rather the reports, for there are two, which have been issued by this Commission, have attracted considerable attention. They have been criticised, not always favourably, by archæologists. On the other hand, they have been praised for their thoroughness; and the principal report, that which is signed by Lord Derby and eight other commissioners who hold very different views—the Duke of Bedford, Lord Sherbrooke, the Lord Chief Justice, Sir Sydney Waterlow, Mr. Pell, the Honourable Walter James, Mr. Firth, and Mr. Burt—for the supposed moderation of its recommendations. Neither Lord Derby nor any of the Commissioners—the other three were, Sir Richard Cross, Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, and Mr. Alderman Cotton—have as yet made any reference to the question in speeches. But three ministers who entered the Cabinet since Lord Derby did so, Sir Charles Dilke, Mr. Trevelyan, and Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, have made speeches, in which they have approved of the recommendations. An episode, too, has lent interest to the Commission. The Lord Chancellor, who is a past master of the Mercers' Company, the first of the 'great' companies in order of civic precedence, appeared before the Commissioners and protested against the view of the position of these corporations with respect to their private property, on which the most important of these recommendations prove to be based.

Assuming, not indeed that the enquiry was necessary, but that it was as desirable as many that have preceded it, there is not much to criticise in the constitution of the tribunal. Lord Derby has had great experience as a chairman of Royal Commissions. The Companies were known to be rich, and

the Duke of Bedford and Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild have the same reputation. They are civic institutions; and two of the Commissioners, Sir Sydney Waterlow and Mr. Alderman Cotton, have held the office of Lord Mayor. The Chief Justice was Secretary of the City of London Commission of 1855, and has a sympathy with the spirit of the middle ages. Mr. Burt belongs to and is respected by the working classes, and the Companies formerly represented the trades of London. Lord Sherbrooke used to be an acute critic. Also the Commissioners have been industrious. They have received deputations, administered searching interrogatories, and conducted a long correspondence. They have investigated the archives of other old towns in England for traces of guilds, and they have enquired, through the Foreign Office and by writing to foreigners, learned men of distinction, as to the way in which the question presented to them has been solved in all the continental countries. The Bishop of Chester, Mr. Froude, Mr. Freeman, M. Emile de Laveleye, M. Pigeonneau of the Sorbonne, and M. Levasseur of the French Institute, have been communicated with. They have prepared elaborate tables of the expenditure of the companies for the ten years preceding their appointment. Finally, they have presented to the Crown two reports which proceed upon opposite and irreconcilable views of the rights of the companies as regards the principal part of their property, one signed by Lord Derby and the Chief Justice; while, throughout the other, Sir Richard Cross perpetually quotes the Lord Chancellor. The ex-Lord Mayors, Sir Sydney Waterlow and Mr. Alderman Cotton, are, perhaps strangely, on different sides. Mr. Pell, a Conservative, votes with Lord Derby and the Chief Justice. Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, a Liberal, feels safer in the company of Sir Richard Cross and the Lord Chancellor. The Companies are evidently not a party question.

The two reports are based on the same facts, figures, and authorities. Of the authorities, the principal are—(1) the returns of the Companies in answer to a very inquisitorial circular of questions issued by the Commissioners soon after their appointment in 1880; (2) the reports of the Inspectors of Charities on the benefactions, upwards of a thousand in number—some eleemosynary, some educational, some founded as early as the fourteenth, some as late as the present century, which the ‘courts’ or governing bodies of the twelve ‘great’ and the fifty-eight ‘minor’ Companies of the City administer.

The Commissioners have examined the courts—(1) as to the origin of the Companies, the terms of their charters, and the circumstances under which they have ceased to be connected with the trades or ‘mysteries’ the names of which they bear; (2) the constitution of the ‘courts’ and the number, grades, and privileges of the members; (3) the salaries and duties of their officers and servants; and (4) the origin and amount of their corporate, i.e. their private, and their trust property respectively, and the objects on which the income arising from each source has been expended during the decennial period 1870–1880. A Royal Commission has not the power of enforcing discovery; so that the Commissioners have not seen any of the title-deeds of the companies, except such abstracts of those relating to charities as the Inspectors of Charities have prepared. But the Commissioners have complimented the draftsmen of the returns—generally, it may be supposed, the clerks of the respective Companies—on the clearness and candour of their answers. The ‘courts’ seem to have thought that the Companies would rather gain than lose credit with the public, or that small part of it which reads Blue Books, by revealing all their secrets. Several of the returns, also, are obviously the work of gentlemen conversant with the archæology of London and having a fine literary taste. We learn, not only exactly what shops, offices, and warehouses in the neighbourhood of St. Paul’s belong to the Salters and Fishmongers, what is the probable value of the plate in the Drapers’ butler’s pantry, or of the wine in the Goldsmiths’ cellars; but also that Chancer was a Vintner and an officer of the Corporation; that Milton’s father belonged to the Scriveners’ Company, and subscribed to buy a house which still belongs to this long-lived little body; and that Verrio, Sir Godfrey Kneller, and Sir Joshua Reynolds were busy craftsmen of the Painter-stainers’ guild. The clerks of the Companies have also made a solid contribution to the history of mediæval industry. Nothing can be more interesting than their citations from their statutes and bylaws with respect to the government of that trade in wool and cloth to which Sir Henry Maine has shown that the early tenures were so well adapted, and which, aided by the Cistercian monasteries and the legislation of Edward III., became to mediæval England what wine is to France, what gold was to California.

The materials provided by the Inspectors of Charities are

even more attractive. The old wills which they publish have the charm of an illuminated missal.

‘Such were the bequests,’ say the biographers of Sir Richard Whittington, ‘by which a great merchant in those days sought to mark in a pious fashion his gratitude to God for a long and honourable career, and to make his wealth a blessing for ever to posterity, to keep his memory green, and to set an example of benevolence as well as of thrift to those who shall come after.’

The thousand charities are readily classified. The first care of every mediæval testator, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, was to obtain, as became a religious Catholic, the prayers of the faithful for his soul in Purgatory. The first trust in an early craftsman’s will is accordingly for an ‘obit’ or obituary mass to be celebrated in some church or chauntry, or in aid of a light to be kept burning before the altar of the saint to which his guild was dedicated. During these centuries there were upwards of a hundred churches in the City (besides monasteries and priories), which were periodically rebuilt, enlarged, beautified, and endowed with lectureships at a vast expense by the predecessors in title of the present Mercers, Grocers, Goldsmiths, Drapers, and the other rich Companies. Prayers for the dead were pronounced a ‘superstitious use’ at the Reformation, and these endowments shared the fate of the monasteries. His next care was for the poor, and particularly for the poor ‘brethren and ‘sisteren’ of his guild. They are expressly named in many of the several hundred charters which the seventy Companies have received between the reign of Edward III. and the present century. Almshouses stood near the halls, and the bakehouses, brewhouses, and butteries, which formed the annexe, provided the rations of the ‘decayed’ brothers and sisters as well as the feasts. Besides the escape of his soul from Purgatory and the relief of the poor, the mediæval testator frequently remembered in his will public purposes which are now dealt with by the State or by municipalities and county boards. The repairing of highways, and the relief of ‘poor prisoners,’ who in those rough times were scarcely so much as lodged, are samples. He also often left bequests for apprenticeship, loans to young men starting in business, and the finding of ‘portions for poor maids,’ *rosières* of good character. After the revival of learning, the more prosperous members of the Companies liberally endowed education. The Lord Almoner’s professorship of Arabic is partly supported by the Drapers’ Company, and the Mercers’, Fish-

mongers', Skinners', Merchant Taylors', Haberdashers', Ironmongers', Clothworkers', Bowyers', Carpenters', Cutlers', Leathersellers', and Saddlers' Companies, are respectively trustees of exhibitions founded at Oxford or Cambridge by craftsmen during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. St. Paul's School, Merchant Taylors' School, Tunbridge School, Aldenham and Great Crosby Schools, and fully twenty other minor schools, which are at present administered by the Companies, were founded by craftsmen during the same period. The provinces have their full share. The early Lord Mayors and aldermen who came up from the country and made fortunes in London did not forget their native villages. The eighteenth century and our time have seen a large addition to this splendid list of benefactions, the donors being in every instance craftsmen. Thus, throughout five centuries, during which society and religion have undergone great changes, it has been the fixed idea of the members of the London Companies that their successors were likely to prove the best trustees available, whether the gift to be protected and administered were an almshouse, a school, an exhibition, a clerical lectureship, or, a matter in which imposture is deplorably rife, a charity for the relief of the blind.

The chain of charity has been kept unbroken by the glamour and prestige of the City of London:—

'The extinction of the Corporation of London,' said Sir William Harcourt in introducing the Bill of last year, 'would be a great shock to the sentiment of this country and the sentiment of this House. . . . There are no traditions more illustrious than those which cluster round the Guildhall. . . . I should be as adverse to destroying the Guildhall as to destroying Westminster Hall or Westminster Abbey.'

Nothing can be more interesting—not even a walk with Addison in the Abbey—or more fascinating to the imagination than the network of wards, churches, public buildings, streets, and alleys, all classical, all having historical names, which surrounds St. Paul's. Besides, the City is the best-governed part of London. The streets are beautifully clean, it is excellently paved and lighted, and it is the port, the greatest in the world, and the business quarter of London. The banks, Lloyd's, and the other insurance offices, the Stock Exchange, Mincing Lane, Mark Lane, the new inventions of every kind, the headquarters of the great dealers in iron, coal, cotton, are in the City; and, to add to its attractions, its old streets are fast being rebuilt and becoming new—to some extent through the agency of the Companies,

who are large ground landlords—with most picturesque architectural results. Therefore Londoners feel it a pride and pleasure to belong to these corporations—whose name ‘livery’ recalls the good old times of costume—which elect the Lord Mayor, exercise English hospitality, and administer a thousand charities. Cabinet ministers of both parties, including the Lord Chancellor, fifty or sixty members of Parliament, bankers, merchants, barristers, are members; some by patrimony, their families having been connected with the Companies for generations; others by purchase, as much as 200*l.* or 300*l.* being often gladly paid for the privilege of calling oneself ‘citizen and Mercer,’ or ‘citizen and Draper;’ and this popularity is increasing. Lately effete Companies—such as the Needlemakers and Fanmakers, which have no attractions in the way of property—have been revived. Two of the Companies to which the late Lord Mayor belonged, the Loriners and Spectaclemakers, whose insignia were carried near the coffin in the imposing ceremony at St. Paul’s, though they represent very ancient mediæval industries, have, practically speaking, no property; yet they are the two largest City guilds. People who can afford it, though they belong to the four millions who live outside the walls, and though they may not have places of business within them, feel that they have only taken brevet rank as Londoners till they have joined one of the old Companies of the City of London.

As to the origin of the guilds, there is, as usual, a learned controversy. Some antiquaries consider them a relic of the Roman occupation; others contend that they are a native, i.e. an Anglo-Saxon, Norman, or Plantagenet institution. London, like all Roman towns contained ‘*collegia opificum*,’ of which the Commissioners say:—

‘They were associations arising out of the urban life of the period, the primary objects of which were common worship and social intercourse, the secondary objects the protection of the trades against unjust taxes, and their internal regulation. They also served as burial clubs, defraying the expenses of burial and funeral sacrifices for deceased members, in some instances out of legacies left for that purpose.’

An admirable Latin scholar, Mr. Reid, states that the resemblance of the Roman ‘*collegia*’ to the London companies in many respects, ‘not excluding that of hospitality,’ is very striking. But Bishop Stubbs and Mr. Freeman simply non-suit the Romans, the latter saying, in a characteristic letter to the Commissioners:—

‘The trade of London is as old as it well can be. The gap between the Roman and English periods is hidden by the blackness of darkness which shrouds our settlement in Britain, and which, to those who have eyes, teaches more clearly than any light could, what the nature of that settlement really was. Had there been any continuity between the institutions of the two periods, that blackness of darkness could hardly have been.’

One of the Companies, that of the Saddlers, claims to be of Anglo-Saxon origin. A parchment found among the archives of St. Martin’s-le-Grand is the evidence on which the guild bases its pretensions. Were time less a destroyer of documents, it might have competitors. However, Norman London was an aggregation of manors, parishes, chapters, monasteries, and trade guilds. Bishop Stubbs speaks of the guilds as ‘administered by their own officers, and administering (through their officers) their property,’ which, where it was land or houses, they held direct from the Crown, without an intervening lord, with the independence and irresponsibility of private owners. The present Companies represent in many cases combinations of these guilds, and the real property which they hold in the City, the sites of their halls and early almshouses, and those of the shops, offices, and warehouses which they own, have belonged to them since the Conquest, or belonged to them even before it. The Plantagenet kings fostered commerce and manufactures. The ‘wools of England’ are called in the Roll of the Ordinance of the Staple ‘the sovereign merchandise and jewel ‘of our realm.’ Edward III. joined the Mercers’, Richard II. the Merchant Taylors’ Company. These monarchs granted charters to many of the present Companies, and the early courts prepared bylaws in conformity with their terms; so that the very corporations which answered the exhaustive interrogatories of Lord Derby and his colleagues have a constitution which is in many cases five hundred years old. And this constitution is a grant from the fountain of honour which has been renewed by ‘inspeximus’ charters during the Wars of the Roses, by Tudor and Stuart sovereigns, by Cromwell, during the reigns of William III. and Queen Anne, and by George I. and George II. The Companies were founded at practically the same time, and the continuity of their existence has been subsequently recognised and guaranteed by the Crown in the same way as that of Oxford and Cambridge and the colleges which form the universities, that of the English bishoprics, chapters, and public schools, the London hospitals, the Inns of Court,

great and small, and the guilds of the old towns, such as Bristol, Coventry, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Norwich, and York, to the history of which the Commissioners have given their attention. The legal effect of charters and bylaws is well known. Charters, in the words of Lord Cairns, 'state the ambit and extent of vitality and power which by law are given to corporations,' and are 'the area beyond which the action of corporations cannot go.' Bylaws are the regulations which the governing bodies are entitled to make for the government and regulation of the corporations 'inside the area' marked out by the charters. There are technical processes, 'quo warranto' and 'scire facias,' by which charters can be declared void, and the first of these was illegally employed by Charles II. against both the City, which had and has many charters, and the Companies. The judgement was, as is well known, set aside. With this exception, no proceeding for the cancellation of a charter has ever been taken against a London Company since the day of its incorporation, and there is no reason to suppose that, at the present day, any such proceeding could be taken with the smallest chance of success, though many of the terms of the charters have become obsolete through change of times. The answer of a Court would now be, 'Why were not these proceedings instituted two or three hundred years ago?' Londoners have given the companies a title by prescription to their property, and have for generations approved of their administration of it as good and faithful stewards.

These charters, all of which have been laid by the Courts before the Commissioners, are instruments constituting the principal capitalists and employers of labour in mediæval London into associations for the administration of its trades, manufactures, and commerce, on those feudal principles of which Mr. Carlyle expresses his admiration in 'Past and Present.' Under them, the artisan had little personal liberty, but a maintenance was secured to him, and he was protected from competition, each company having a monopoly of the 'mystery' which it represented. He was clothed, relieved in sickness and old age, and buried by the guild, and his sons could claim to be admitted to its privileges as apprentices. The Courts, which still govern, were responsible to the Crown and the municipality for the enforcement of a system of punctual discipline depending on innumerable statutes and precepts. They met at the halls once a week or more frequently to hear cases, to settle trade disputes,

and to consider claims on their charities. They employed searchers who took official 'walks' through the quarters appropriated to the different industries, and who attended the markets and fairs, where they destroyed 'deceitful' wares. The Poultry, the Vintry, Ironmonger Lane, and Paternoster Row, are names which recall these days of honesty by compulsion. Mercers' Hall has become, since the formation of the admirable City and Guilds' Technical Institute, the headquarters of technical education; but in this the beautiful building has only become itself again, for the hall of every trade in those times had receipts and processes which it was treason to divulge. There has always been an aristocracy and a democracy. The Mercers, Grocers, Drapers, and Goldsmiths, associations of the illustrious founders of the trade and commerce of England, which contain many of their descendants, have for centuries been a little distant in their relations with such homely mechanics as the Saddlers and the Waxhandlers. Banking was first taught at Goldsmiths' Hall, but land existed before money, and land in the City has been the chief property of the guilds since they were founded. A group of merchants, manufacturers, or tradesmen, subscribed to a common purse. When they could afford it they built a hall. As the fund increased, there being no poor law and no State education, they built an almshouse and a school, and, Consols not existing, if the guild continued to prosper, the Court invested its savings in house property in its quarter and the neighbourhood. This is the origin of the large metropolitan estate of the Companies. The legacies, too, which are the foundation of their thousand charities, were generally of land—not always in the City—at present they have estates in every county in England, some property in the Isle of Man, and, as is well known, a large estate in Ireland—or of charges on, or of money to be converted into, land. A common meal has always been as much of their essence as a common purse. Many of the banquets at present attended by the liverymen are expressly provided for in the charters, and if the Courts did not give them, they would render themselves liable at law.

All mediæval institutions which have survived to this day have undergone important changes, and the Companies are now more unlike what they once were than the Church, the Universities, or even the Inns of Court. They still appear in the pageant on Lord Mayor's Day. A few discharge public functions. Stationers' Hall and Apothecaries' Hall

do good work. The Fishmongers appoint inspectors at Billingsgate. The Goldsmiths assay plate and keep the pyx. The Gunmakers have a proof house. The Vintners and Dyers protect the swans on the Thames. But their glory, as the representatives of English industry and enterprise, has departed. Their searches ceased soon after their masses for the dead. As Sir Richard Cross and his colleagues say :—

‘The period of the cesser of the connexion of the Companies with the trade and manufactures of London is approximately that of the Reformation, and as Catholicism was of the essence of their religious rules, at the time when they ceased to have any control over the trades and industries from which they took their names, they also ceased to be in any real sense religious fraternities. Thus, of their three original functions, two—those of common worship and association for commercial purposes—became obsolete about four centuries ago. Their remaining function, that of hospitality and charity, has since been the only one which it has been possible for them to discharge.’

‘A nursery of charities and a seminary of good citizens’ is the definition given by the Grocers of their modern as opposed to their mediæval status. But it is a popular delusion, as the Commissioners point out, to suppose that the companies ever consisted exclusively of craftsmen. From time immemorial the privileges of membership have been hereditary, and the effect of admission by ‘patrimony’ is shown in facts proved in the returns. For example, as early as 1445 only one skinner belonged to the Skinners’ Company, and by the express terms of their charters the Haberdashers’ and Merchant Taylors’ guilds have always been open to all callings.

The good citizens have indeed nursed their charities. The Fire ruined them. Their halls and almshouses and most of their house property in the City were destroyed in it. Their charities consisted almost entirely of rents and rent-charges, and in those times fire insurance did not exist. If it had not been for a very large subscription by the members out of their private means, there might not now be any City Companies to enquire into, or their charities might not be upwards of a thousand in number. Previously, when their ‘obits’ and chauntries were suppressed, they redeemed the other charities specified in the superstitious wills, at a cost of 20,000*l.*, a large sum at the time of the Reformation. They were heavily taxed for the Scotch wars, for the Spanish war—some of their trust funds are for the commemoration of the defeat of the Armada—by the Crown and the Parliament

alternately during the Rebellion, and they also bore civic burdens. They had for many years to provide grain and coal for the poor of London in times of scarcity. The result has been that till the present century they have generally been in difficulties. Mercers' Hall and Grocers' Hall have often been deeply mortgaged. But the lamp of public spirit has been kept burning from generation to generation. It appears that the Merchant Taylors' School has no endowment, and that the company spent between 1870 and 1880 140,000*l.* upon this single object. The Commissioners also say that the Companies generally have shown 'great liberality' in the management of their other schools, that they do not charge the five per cent. allowed in Chancery for administration, and that the Charity Commissioners speak most highly of the Courts as trustees.

The last great event in their history—though in one sense they have been always so identified with the City that its noble history, and that consequently of England, is peculiarly theirs—was the part forced upon them by James II. in the colonisation of Ulster. One of the reports says:—

'They found these estates a desert, and by their care and munificence they have made them one of the most prosperous parts of the United Kingdom. Indeed, they may be said to have founded at their own expense the loyal province of Ulster, a service to the Crown perhaps without a parallel, except the service rendered by the Honourable East India Company.'

The other report says:—

'The companies contribute largely to the Ulster charities, both religious and secular, and also have of late subsidised new railways by grants of land and loans. These sums taken together amount to a deduction from the rents greatly exceeding the sum commonly contributed to such purposes by private landlords.'

Travellers by railway in Ulster have often noticed the superior cultivation of their agricultural lands, the neat farmhouses, and the remarkable air of comfort. Like other Irish landlords they have recently sold a good deal of this property.

At present the Companies contain 30,000 or 40,000 members, more than half being 'freemen' or probationers—London artisans for the most part whose ancestors have been freemen, and who enter because of the many charities for the benefit of poor brethren and poor sisters. Some of these are for the support of almshouses, now for the most part removed from the City to more suitable parts of London or

into the country; others for gifts of bread, clothing, or medicines. There are 7,000 or 8,000 liverymen, or full members, and of these 1,500 have 'passed the chair,' often an expensive process, and form the Courts. The widows and orphan daughters of deceased members are the chief recipients of charity. Misfortune is not confined to artisans, and past masters have ended their days in the almshouses of the companies.

The joint income of the guilds is now large. The Commissioners estimate it at upwards of 700,000*l.* a year; but in this estimate is included a sum representing (1) the rateable value of their buildings, i.e. halls, schools, and almshouses, which is more than 70,000*l.* a year; (2) their plate, which is very valuable; so that the *income*, properly speaking, which they really administer, is probably about 600,000*l.* a year. At the commencement of the century it did not amount to half this sum. Of this total one third, or 200,000*l.*, arises from the trust estate, i.e. the thousand legacies to charitable purposes. The Charity Commission controls and audits this part of the expenditure. The Court of Chancery and the Commissioners have settled a number of schemes, promoted mostly by the Companies themselves, for the better application of the funds, where the objects such as 'poor prisoners,' 'poor maids,' and 'loan charities' have become obsolete through change of times. The cost of the almshouses and pensions to poor members amounts to 75,000*l.*; that of the schools and exhibitions is also 75,000*l.*; the remaining 50,000*l.* is spent on 'charitable objects of a general kind.' The corporate or private income of the companies is 400,000*l.* a year. This is money absolutely theirs in the eye of the law, and which the Courts are entitled to spend as they think proper, as if the Companies were private gentlemen. Of it 150,000*l.* is spent by them on education or in charity. Merchant Taylors' School, the Grocers' Middle-Class School at Hackney, and the City and Guilds Technical Institute are supported out of it, and a very large sum is annually voted to the charities of London. More than 100,000*l.* was subscribed to the Technical Institute during the ten years over which the enquiry has extended, and a single company--the Grocers'--contributed during that period more than 25,000*l.* to the London Hospital. The entertainments cost 100,000*l.* a year; but the hospitality of the City of London ought to be splendid, and in the halls honour has been done to generations of generals and statesmen. The Companies spend, on the restoration of their halls,

the improvement of their estates—especially that of those in Ireland—and salaries, about 150,000*l.* a year. Many of them, however, have no property. They are simply associations of gentlemen who are content to give one or two subscription dinners a year for the sake of belonging to a City Company. ‘Of the 7,000 liverymen about half receive ‘nothing in any way from inherited funds, though their ‘contributions in fines and fees amount to a very considerable sum.’

Every market town, almost every hamlet in England, had at one time its guild;* the towns of the Staple, that curious federation of trades of which London was the head, contained many. These were mostly disestablished and disendowed at the Reformation, but a few survive. The Merchant Adventurers of Bristol are believed to possess a considerable estate. The Cutlers’ Feast is still held at Sheffield. The Commissioners find that the halls of some of the provincial guilds which survived the downfall of Catholicism have been sold, the last of the craftsmen dividing the proceeds, as the judges did those of Serjeants’ Inn after the suppression of the Order of Serjeants, a precedent which the ‘Ancients’ of some of the Inns of Chancery appear to have followed. On the continent, Colbert reorganised and Turgot attempted to suppress the French guilds, which perished along with other institutions in the Revolution. Those of Belgium and the Netherlands shared their fate at the same time, or shortly afterwards. During the present century the guilds of other continental countries have been suppressed or reformed on bureaucratic principles. But it is well known that De Tocqueville did not agree with Turgot, and the Commissioners publish a protest against State intervention from M. Emile de Laveleye:—

‘Les abus auxquels avaient donné lieu l’existence et l’administration des corporations ont inspiré cette législation si sévère, conforme d’ailleurs à l’esprit individualiste du dix-huitième siècle. Elle est peut-être nécessaire dans les pays catholiques pour empêcher que le sol tout entier ne passe aux mains des corporations religieuses, mais on ne peut nier qu’elle ne soit un obstacle à la création de beaucoup d’œuvres utiles et qu’elle n’amène ainsi l’extension incessante et indispensable de l’intervention de l’Etat.’

In Switzerland, as in England, there has been as yet no special legislation, and the companies of Berne still prosper.

These facts are the basis of both reports. It further

* See ‘Edin. Review,’ vol. cxxxiv. p. 312, ‘English Guilds.’

appears that, whereas the Municipal Commissioners who sat at the Guildhall in 1834 were frequently appealed to by liverymen with grievances, only two malcontents appeared before Lord Derby and his colleagues. The inference is that the constitution of the companies works better now than it did fifty years since. Mr. Hare, the advocate of minority representation, who, as an inspector of charities, has acquired considerable knowledge of the endowments of the companies, was the only person of any importance who suggested any further alterations in their constitution to the recent Commission; and Mr. Hare's scheme 'was considered 'by all the Commissioners to be impracticable.' Neither the Corporation of London nor the Charity Commission thought it necessary to make any representation to the Commissioners. Mr. Burt took but a small part in proceedings, as the question does not interest the working classes. Under these circumstances the Commissioners might have framed a unanimous report containing a summary of the results of the enquiry without reference to the last clause of their credentials, in which they are empowered 'to consider and report what measures, if any, are expedient 'for improving or altering the constitution of the companies.' Precedents borrowed from revolutionary France or bureaucratic Germany have little weight. Londoners are content to leave the companies to themselves. The words 'if any' are an admission that a scheme of reform is a work of supererogation. Lord Derby and his colleagues have, however, been ambitious, and have in consequence disagreed.

The point with respect to which the difference has arisen is that which has occurred to M. de Laveleye as it did to De Tocqueville with respect to the mediæval guilds of France and Belgium, which perished in the Revolution. Is a case made out for '*l'extension incessante et indispensable de l'intervention de l'État*'? Ought, or ought not, Parliament to interfere with the Companies—the Commissioners do not regard their suppression as a matter worth consideration—in the management of their affairs? Lord Derby, Lord Coleridge, and six other Commissioners, answer in the affirmative; Sir Richard Cross and two other Commissioners, supported by the Lord Chancellor, in the negative. Of the thirteen disputants, the Lord Chancellor speaks with the greatest authority, as he has been at the head of his profession for twenty years and belongs to that branch of it which deals with the law of real property and that of charitable trusts. Or rather, to be precise, eleven out of

the twelve Commissioners recommend that Parliament should interfere to a limited extent, viz. by compelling the Companies to publish their accounts annually in a statutable form, as the Colleges of Oxford and Cambridge have recently been compelled to do; and nine out of twelve recommend Parliamentary interference of a comprehensive kind, by the passing of an Act which, in addition to securing publication of accounts, shall provide for (1) restraint of alienation—i.e. the Companies are to be prevented from selling their property without the consent of the Treasury, like Municipal Corporations; (2) the abolition of the 'livery' Parliamentary franchise; (3) the appointment of a Commission with powers similar to that of the last Universities Commission, to recast the charters and bylaws of the Companies, to secure the application of a considerable part of their private income to 'purposes of acknowledged public utility,' and to revise and alter as it pleases the thousand charitable trusts which they administer. Nothing is to be sacred which came into the Companies' hands more than fifty years ago. In other words, Parliament is to tear up the wills of Sir Richard Whittington, Sir Thomas Gresham, and all the great Londoners who have endowed the companies. Parliament is also to declare that to be public property which the courts of law have a hundred times declared to be private property. 'The Fishmongers' Company were from the first 'beneficial owners of this property,' said Lord Cottenham, speaking of an estate owned by the company and dealt with by them as private owners since 1434. This is to be handed over to the ratepayers of London. They are the real 'purposes of acknowledged public utility.' 'This revenue,' said Lord Langdale, 'according to the construction which it appears to me ought to be put on the codicil, belongs as private property to the Grocers' Company.' The date of the codicil is 1656. The revenue is to become public property.

'It will be seen,' say the Goldsmiths' Company in their return, 'that a great, if not the greatest, part of the property held by us was acquired by purchase from the Crown. It is held by as good a title as any property in the kingdom, and it appears to us—and if properly considered would, we believe, appear to law-makers as well as to lawyers—that if Parliament were to dispossess us of any portion of our property, or to interfere with the appropriation of its revenues without compensation, a principle of law would be attacked, by the violation of which the property of every landowner in the kingdom would be rendered insecure.'

The land alluded to is that which the Company redeemed

from the Crown at its own expense after the confiscation at the Reformation. It is to be again confiscated.

‘I rather decline,’ says the Lord Chancellor, ‘to contemplate anything which may be done in the way of redistribution of the Companies’ own funds. The City Companies, assuming them to be, as I believe them to be in law, absolute and perfect masters of their own property . . . the funds which I call their own property were derived from their own subscriptions and gifts from their own members and others, and were intended to be for their absolute use.’*

Lord Selborne was for years on the Court of the Mercers’ Company, and understands the interpretation of wills. Lord Coleridge and Sir Frederick Bramwell, a celebrated witness, had the following discussion: †—

‘*Lord Coleridge.* As I understand, you contend that the great bulk of the property of the Goldsmiths’ Company is absolutely their private property; is that so?’

‘*Sir F. Bramwell.* Yes.

‘*Lord Coleridge.* And that it is subject to no legal restraint whatever?’

‘*Sir F. Bramwell.* Yes.

‘*Lord Coleridge.* And might, if the company chose, be divided among the members of the company to-morrow?’

‘*Sir F. Bramwell.* Legally, I presume it might be. I have not in the slightest degree suggested that anything of the kind would be done.

‘*Lord Coleridge.* Neither do I suggest it; I only say that it might be so, according to your view.

‘*Sir F. Bramwell.* I hardly like to talk law to your lordship, but certainly that is our view; and I am fortified in this by the opinion of the Lord Chancellor, with whom I had the honour of attending the Commission on a former occasion.

‘*Lord Coleridge.* I suppose your legal position, in your view, would be the same, if the companies, or your company, had ten times or twenty times the amount of property that they now possess?’

‘*Sir F. Bramwell.* That is so.

‘*Lord Coleridge.* Or if they owned half England?’

‘*Sir F. Bramwell.* Or if they owned half England. It does not appear to me that the fact that I have got something which is doubly coveted makes it doubly the property of somebody who would like to get it.

‘*Lord Coleridge.* And in your view the State would be guilty of spoliation, as I understand (confiscation, I think, is the expression that you make use of), or something approaching to confiscation, if in the general interest it interfered with the holding of property on the part of anyone, however exaggerated and large that holding might be?’

‘*Sir F. Bramwell.* I should certainly think so. It is the first

time I ever heard it suggested that there should be a limit to the property held by an individual.

'Lord Coleridge. I suggest nothing.

'Sir F. Bramwell. I will not say that your Lordship suggests it. It is a new proposition to me that there should be a limit to property held in one person's hands. . . . It appears to me a somewhat dangerous doctrine to say, "I will consider whether this property is large or small, and if it is small you may keep it; if it is not, I will consider whether it shall not be taken from you."

The champion of the companies clearly had the best of it. To these remarkable theories Sir Richard Cross, Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, and Mr. Alderman Cotton, supported by the Lord Chancellor, strongly object. The two reports are before the public, and '*securus judicabit orbis.*' But the influence of the City and the Companies is itself considerable, and the House of Lords may be found to contain severe and interested critics of a scheme which, if philanthropic, also savours of communism. Lord Coleridge may not make many proselytes in his new sphere.

As to 'restraint of alienation,' why is Parliament to impose a restriction on the Companies of the City of London which is not to apply to the Merchant Adventurers of Bristol or the Cutlers of Sheffield? If they really were 'municipal corporations,' they would already be under the necessity of communicating with the Treasury before executing a conveyance, but they are not cities or boroughs. There might be a pretence for interference, if there were ground for supposing that the Courts were likely to follow the example of the judges and solicitors who sold and divided the proceeds of Serjeants' Inn, and of the old Inns of Chancery which are the picturesque element in Holborn. But the Commissioners, with all their diligence, have not discovered a single instance of a City guild having dissolved and divided. The courts did not wind up the fraternities in the worst pinch of poverty, and they are not likely to do so in the present heyday of their wealth, when a foot of land east of Temple Bar is worth as many sovereigns as will cover its surface. The Masters and Wardens are never so eloquent as when they protest against the confiscations of the lawyers. It is, they say, an insult to their time-honoured toast—'The Companies of London, root and branch may they flourish for ever!'—to suppose that they do not understand the doctrine of perpetual succession better, though they may not have had the same professional training. If the precedent of Oxford and Cambridge is applicable, there is no 'restraint

‘of alienation’ in the case of either the universities or the colleges, except as regards trust property. The Students of Christ Church and the Fellows of Trinity are free to speculate in land for the common benefit, without the ceremony of permission by a circumlocution office. The companies have shown themselves equally good landlords if not better. Why are they alone to be harassed? Again, the worldly goods of the Needlemakers, the Fannmakers, and about twenty other companies, consist of two or three hundred pounds at a bank, arising wholly from dues paid by present members to the common purse. Are the Lords of the Treasury to go through the solemn farce of empowering the Renter Wardens of such bodies to sign cheques? In short, ‘restraint of alienation’ can and will do no good, and the companies need it perhaps less than any English corporation. They have not even the system of ‘beneficial’ leases with heavy fines for renewal, which was at one time a constant feature in academical accounts, and which has led to the treatment of some of the capital of Oxford and Cambridge as divisible income.

The second recommendation is as above stated, the publication annually of the accounts of the companies in, it is presumed, some statutable form. The accounts of their charities are, however, already rendered to the Charity Commission pursuant to a statute. As to private expenditure, the recent Commission has, by publishing analyses of it for the period 1870–80, brought to light such facts as that some of the companies spend half of their private incomes on public or benevolent objects, while in the case of others the private income is a mere nothing compared with the trust income. Thus the worthy Brewers who supplied ale to the troops at Agincourt have a trust income, the growth of four centuries, of 15,000*l.*, as against a private income of 3,000*l.* a year; while of the Painter-stainers’ nominal income of 4,000*l.*, only 1,000*l.* is their own to spend as they choose. Facts like these, if laid annually before all London, might be useful to the City and the Companies. But the dissentient is Mr. Alderman Cotton, the senior member for the City, and his *non possumus* is significant.

The majority of the Commissioners next propose to deprive the liverymen of the parliamentary franchise. With the municipal franchise they do not deal, apparently because they think it desirable, as it is, that it should continue possible to elect the Lord Mayor. But it seems an artificial construction of the word ‘privileges’ to extend it to such

a matter, and technically the liverymen have votes, not so much because of their grade in the guilds to which they belong, as owing to their civic status as freemen of the City, so that this recommendation is perhaps *ultra vires*. The qualification of voters is surely a subject for a Reform Bill. As a fact, however, the disfranchisement of the liveries, however great a shock to the traditions of the City, would produce only an infinitesimal effect on the balance of parties. The Liberal and Conservative liverymen are almost equal in number, and are evenly distributed throughout the companies, only two of which, the Fishmongers and Merchant Taylors, have any decided political complexion.

It is further recommended 'that the State shall intervene 'for the purposes of (1) securing the permanent application 'of a considerable portion of the corporate (i.e. private) income of the companies to useful purposes, (2) declaring 'new trusts in cases in which a better application of the 'trust income of the companies has become desirable.' Probably the Companies would suggest that they have themselves already carried out the first branch of the recommendation, and that as to the second it is unfair to select their trusts, as if they were the worst instead of about the best trustees in England, as a *corpus vile* for curious experiments.

Out of their private income they at present (1) add to the incomes of more than a thousand charities, which means that they prevent any of the 20,000 artisans who belong to them from becoming paupers, subsidise Oxford and Cambridge by increasing the number and value of their exhibitions, many of the holders of which have been and are distinguished scholars and mathematicians, and assist nearly all the schools of which they are trustees, (2) that they have founded Merchant Taylors' School and the Grocers' School at Hackney, professorships at University College and at King's College, London, scholarships in connexion with the London School Board, and the newly founded colleges, Girton College and Newnham College, for the higher education of women, (3) that they have organised a system of technical education throughout England, at an expense of 30,000*l.* a year, (4) that they contribute 90,000*l.* a year to the Mansion House funds, to the charities of London, of the country places in England in which they have estates and in Ulster, (5) that they have had a share in the 'Fisheries' and 'Healtheries' exhibitions, and have recently taken up the endowment of scientific research and the College of

Music. What more can be expected of them? Of their system of technical education Professor Huxley says :—

‘ I am perfectly certain that you have now in this system of technological examinations, in the higher schools of technical instruction, such as the Finsbury College, and in this central institution of which the body already exists, and of which the soul is in such a fair state of preparation that it may be said “*mens agitat molem*,” unquestionably and indubitably the nucleus of a vast growth of similar organisations. I have not the smallest doubt that in place of two or three high schools of technical education there will soon be scores in different parts of these islands, and that you will have in this Central Institute a great uniting point for the whole of this vast network, through which the information and the discipline which are needful for carrying the industry of this country to perfection will be distributed into every locality in which such industries are carried on.’

Technical education was of course one of the objects for the promotion of which the Companies were incorporated. Hospitality is as much one of their remaining functions as charity and public spirit, and the entertainment of foreign sovereigns and successful generals and admirals like Lord Wolseley and Lord Alcester by the Companies as representatives of London is itself an ‘object of acknowledged public utility,’ and one to which it is the plain duty of the Courts to apply the corporate funds.

As to the ‘declaration of new trusts in cases in which a ‘better application of the companies’ trust income has ‘become desirable,’ the Commissioners say that ‘the facts that several of the numerous charities of which the trust estate consists date from the fourteenth century, and that nearly all were founded more than fifty years since, prove in their opinion the necessity for a revision of the trusts.’ It may be doubted whether these facts will appear equally cogent to others. A judge of the Chancery Division in which trusts are administered would probably regard a prescription of five hundred years with some respect. If the law permitted charitable trusts to be declared obsolete at the end of so short a period as fifty years, the fountain of benevolence would be dried up. Those who leave money by will to a particular object intend to support that object and no other. For instance, about fifty years ago, Mr. Thwaites, a popular member of the Clothworkers’ Company, on whose testamentary capacity no imputation could be cast, left a considerable sum by will to the Master, Wardens, and Court in trust to give an annual entertainment with the interest. Mr. Thwaites’s legacy was not immoral, why should it be set aside? Besides, why should the charities of the Com-

panies be singled out for special legislation? There ought surely to be one law of charitable trusts for all England. If the administration of them by the Court of Chancery be defective, let it be reformed. If the Charity Commission requires additional powers, let it receive them. But do not cripple excellent trustees like the London Companies, and at the same time discourage present and future great Londoners from following the bright example of Sir Richard Whittington and Sir Thomas Gresham.

We have said that the phrase 'objects of acknowledged public utility' is a roundabout expression for the relief of the ratepayers. The Commissioners

'are of opinion that objects of acknowledged public utility should be defined as follows:—

'(1) Scholastic and scientific objects, i.e. elementary education, secondary education, classical education, technical education, scientific research.

'(2) General public purposes, e.g. hospitals, picture galleries, museums, public baths, parks, and open spaces.

'(3) The improvement of workmen's dwellings, and, where the companies represent trades, subsidies to the benefit societies of such trades.'

The enumeration is apparently based upon some recent schemes framed by the Chancery Division and the Charity Commission in cases of obsolete charities. It has no reference to the charters of the Companies or the wills of their benefactors. All the 'scholastic and scientific objects' are already supported by the Companies except primary education, which is the subject of a rate. Of the other two groups, hospitals and workmen's benefit societies are at present subsidised by the Companies, but all the other objects except workmen's dwellings are commonly paid for out of the rates, and workmen's dwellings are, if anyone's business except that of the landlord and tenant, that of the Municipality. What are the Companies to the ratepayers of London, or the ratepayers of London to the Companies? Why are the Companies to make presents to the vestries any more than Lord Derby or the Duke of Bedford?

A Commission, apparently of the same kind as those which have been recently occupied in bringing Oxford and Cambridge into harmony with the age, is to be the machinery by which the recommendations of these noblemen and their colleagues are to be applied to the Companies; and this body is to undertake in addition, 'should it prove practicable, the 'reorganisation of the companies.' Of the nine Commis-

sioners who are in favour of 'reorganisation,' only one, Sir Sydney Waterlow, is on the court of a Company; whereas the three dissentients, Sir Richard Cross, Sir Nathaniel de Rothschild, and Mr. Alderman Cotton, are all members of courts. Here, therefore, experience at any rate is peculiar to the minority. They say, 'We think this purpose impracticable,' and speaking of 'patrimony,' which some of the majority—not probably Lord Derby or the Duke of Bedford—'regard as an antiquated and unsatisfactory qualification for membership,' they say, 'any person having the slightest knowledge of the London Companies must be aware that patrimony is the very essence of their constitution. But for the hereditary nature of the privileges which they confer, they would probably have long ago ceased to exist, and few new members would now join them.' These observations seem very just, and we think that the Lord Chancellor, whose family have been Mercers for four generations, would probably endorse them. But a Royal Commission is bound to propose the 'reorganisation' of the institutions into which it has been commanded to enquire, in order not to appear to have been itself a mistake. The guilds are, however, *sui generis*, and if they were at all changed would cease to be themselves, the Companies of London, which have a constitution as old and unaltered as that of the City.

Probably no Government of which Lord Selborne is a member will ever introduce a bill embodying the scheme which we have criticised. Indeed, if we are not mistaken, the Government have substituted for the bill suggested by the Commissioners Sir Charles Dilke's 'Corporate Property Security Bill,' a measure of a general kind, in which no invidious mention is made of the Companies, and which simply provides against a repetition of transactions like the sale of Serjeants' Inn. If it passed, it would not affect the companies in any way, as they are not at all tired of existence. Several have stated that they should not object to pay succession duty, as they do not see why the private property of corporations should be exempt from a burden which is properly imposed on that of individuals; but a law to this effect must of course be general. They appear to object to the publication of their accounts, but on this point the Commission has certainly spoken with considerable authority.

We have entered at some length upon this subject not only because it is of interest in itself, but because the attack

on the City Livery Companies involves an attack on two principles of far greater moment—the rights of property and the rights of freedom. This seems to us to be a flagrant example of the insatiable desire of the State to subject everything to its own despotic control—to interfere where no interference is required or can be justified—and to overrule the strongest titles of property and possession for some popular purpose. Such acts are mortal aggressions on liberty and ownership, and they are equally to be deplored, whether they are the work of a Roman Emperor, a French King, or a democratic Assembly. An excellent society has recently been formed under the auspices of Lord Wemyss and Lord Bramwell for the defence of liberty and property against this system of rapacious legislation. We wish it all possible success. For, strange as it may appear, there are in our times men who hold that the antiquity of a title is its greatest defect, and that nothing in the shape of a perpetual settlement or endowment should be tolerated by the law. From these views we wholly dissent. We believe that the large amount of settled property in this country is one of the most solid pillars of society, and that a successful attempt to destroy it by arbitrary legislation would go far to level the edifice to the ground.

ART. VIII.—1. *The Relations between Religion and Science.* Bampton Lectures. By the Right Rev. FREDERICK, late Bishop of Exeter, and now of London. 8vo. 1885.

2. *The Pontifical Decrees against the Doctrine of the Earth's Movement.* By the Rev. WILLIAM W. ROBERTS. 1885.

AMONGST the various agencies which help to sustain or undermine the prosperity and to accelerate or to retard the progress of a nation, the teaching of its clergy must play a very considerable part. If a people is to be congratulated who possess an exemplary clergy with no desire to maintain effete beliefs, and who repudiate degrading superstitions, still more so is that nation many of whose pastors seek sympathetically to enter into the views of their opponents in order to generate a higher harmony by wedding the truths for which such opponents may contend with complementary truths which they mistake or ignore.

This remark is suggested by the able and deeply interesting book of Dr. Temple, the title of which heads this article. It is long since we have met with a work of this

kind, at once so uncompromising and effective in its maintenance of essentials, and so temperate and sympathetic in its treatment of questions fairly open to dispute. The Bishop's work is eminently a work in harmony with the principles of this Journal. Though it has ever been our privilege to labour in promoting the cause of enlightenment and progress, and to shrink from the advocacy of no changes which were truly liberal, yet we are all conservative of something; and we have ever consistently and strenuously opposed a narrow, intolerant Jacobinism, no less in the field of speculative thought than in the direction of practical politics. In the work in question, its right reverend author endeavours to show the real harmony which underlies the apparent divergence between Christianity and modern physical science, in a manner essentially similar to that of his great predecessor Bishop Butler, though with developements adapted to meet the more profoundly negative and aggressive unbelief of our own day. He also makes use of some of the arguments of Paley, pointing out—we think justly—how of late they have been somewhat unduly depreciated, even by Christian apologists, and how they may be taken in a sense applicable to the modern theory of evolution. He defends the Christian revelation on the ground that its claims are but the harmonious further extension of those demands which natural religion makes upon our reason, and which reason cannot without a self-stultifying suicide refuse. As this Journal is not one devoted to questions of revealed religion, we shall make here slight reference to his treatment of revelation; confining ourselves almost entirely to his contention with respect to natural religion, which, as a question lying at the root of *all* religious beliefs, must concern a greater number of our readers, and is a matter which has a political as well as an intellectual interest, bearing directly as it does on the springs of our national life and character.

The Bishop points out in his first three chapters how an apparent conflict necessarily arises between religion and science from the divergence which exists between their very starting-points in the human mind. Though both arise from our intimate consciousness of the action of our own will, yet science* starts from the idea of 'force' which it has unconsciously thence derived, while the fundamental religious idea springs from a similarly derived idea of

* By 'science' Dr. Temple means physical science only, and, therefore, that word is also here used by us in that restricted sense.

'obligation.' The origin and nature of scientific belief is the subject of his initial chapter, and the first problem to which he addresses himself is that of our conviction as to the 'uniformity of nature.' It is a conviction necessary for science.* What then is its source? What is its justification? What, if any, are its limits? As he truly says :--

'It is not an assumption that belongs to science only. It is in some form or other at the bottom of all our daily life. We eat our food on the assumption that it will nourish us to-day as it nourished us yesterday. We deal with our neighbours in the belief that we may safely trust those now whom we have trusted and safely trusted heretofore. We never take a journey without assuming that wood and iron will hold a carriage together, that wheels will roll upon axles, that steam will expand and drive the piston of an engine, that porters and stokers and engine-drivers will do their accustomed duties. Our crops are sown in the belief that the earth will work its usual chemistry, that heat and light and rain will come in their turn and have their usual effects, and the harvest will be ready for our gathering in the autumn. Look on while a man is tried for his life before a jury. Every tittle of the evidence is valued both by the judge and jury according to its agreement or disagreement with what we believe to be the laws of nature; and if a witness asserts that something happened which, as far as we know, never happened at any other time since the world began, we set his evidence aside as incredible. And the prisoner is condemned if the facts before us, interpreted on the assumption that the ordinary laws of nature have held their course, appear to prove his guilt.'

Hume and Kant each gave his solution of the question, 'What right have we to make this assumption?' And the validity of each of their answers rests upon its claim to be the simplest sufficient answer to explain all the facts.

Hume, grounding his reply upon the relation of cause and effect, answered that it was the mere result of custom without anything rational behind it. But, in the first place, we discover invariability much faster than we discover causation; it occupies a far larger portion of our mental field of view, not only at first, but always. 'As science advances it is seen that the regularity of phenomena is far more important to us than their causes. And the attention of all students of nature is fixed on that rather than on causation.' The explanation of it, therefore, by the idea of

* He speaks of it, indeed, as the 'supreme postulate' of science, but probably does not intend to apply the term with strict accuracy. The really 'supreme postulate' of science is the 'principle of contradiction.' '*Nothing can both be and not be at the same time and in the same sense.*'

causation is insufficient as well as historically false. Moreover, even if it were sufficient in one way, it still would not be so in another, since it does not explain all the facts as to the idea of causation itself. For that idea, as it exists in the minds of most men, is not that which Hume and his followers pretend that it is. It is not merely 'uniform, unconditional sequence.' It includes the conception of a power exercised by, an influence which passes from, one thing over to another thing. This conception, therefore, remains unaccounted for by Hume. How the Bishop accounts for it we shall shortly see.

Kant's account of the fact is based upon his theory that the human mind has, in its own structure, certain conditions which necessarily produce conceptions of a certain kind, which conceptions indeed are the only ones possible to it. Our author gives an excellent illustration of Kant's system by referring to the kaleidoscope. In that well-known common toy

'bits of coloured glass placed at one end are seen through a small round hole at the other. The bits of glass are not arranged in any order whatever, and by shaking the instrument may be rearranged again and again indefinitely and still without any order whatever. But, however they may be arranged in themselves, they always form, as seen from the other end, a symmetrical pattern. The pattern, indeed, varies with every shake of the instrument, and consequent rearrangement of the bits of glass, but it is invariably symmetrical. Now the symmetry in this case is not in the bits of glass; the colours are there no doubt, but the symmetrical arrangement of them is not. The symmetry is entirely due to the instrument. And if a competent enquirer looks into the instrument and examines its construction, he will be able to lay down with absolute certainty the laws of that symmetry which every pattern as seen through the instrument must obey.'

According to Kant the human mind is just such an instrument. Like the kaleidoscope, it arranges all things which it perceives in patterns according to the laws of its own structure, and whatever things, if any there be, which cannot be so arranged, cannot be understood by it. But, wonderfully ingenious as is this hypothesis, it is insufficient; for there are facts for which it cannot account. Thus we can imagine ourselves, mind and all, as non-existent, but we cannot imagine space as non-existent. Yet, if the latter be but a subordinate part of the mind, we may well ask with Dr. Temple, 'How is it we can picture to ourselves the non-existence of the mind which is the whole, but not the non-existence of space which, according to this hypothesis,

'is but the part?' Again, we are not only obliged to imagine space, but we all have the conviction that space really exists, and that really extended bodies are present on every side of us. This conviction upon Kant's theory must, however, be a mere delusion; but most certainly a theory which requires us to call an ineradicable conviction of consciousness 'a delusion' cannot be said to explain all the facts. Yet its entire claim to our acceptance rests purely and simply on its supposed power of explaining all the facts. Moreover, as to the uniform succession of events we have evidently no such ineradicable conviction as we have with respect to external space. A man is not constrained to believe that, if one event is followed by another a great many times, it will be so followed always. The question, therefore, by what right we assume the uniformity of nature, remains still unanswered. The answer which Bishop Temple makes to this question is, 'We believe it to be uniform because we find it to be so.' And it is this truth which lies at the root of Hume's mistaken representation that our belief in causation is due to custom.

'Millions on millions of observations concur in exhibiting this uniformity. And the longer our observation of nature goes on the greater do we find the extent of it. Things that once seemed irregular are now known to be regular. Things that seemed inexplicable on this hypothesis are now explained. Every day seems to add immensely to the instances of the wide-ranging classes of phenomena that come under the rule. . . . We believe in the uniformity of nature because, as far as we can observe it, that is the character of nature.'

Our author here uses the word 'character' on purpose, for the excellent reason that it well expresses both the nature and the limitation of our belief; for beyond the assertion of the general truths of this uniformity our mental impulse does not compel us to go, while stern logic absolutely forbids our further advance. Though every instance of nature's uniformity adds to our confidence in its continuance and generality, though there is far more evidence for the uniformity as a whole than there is for any single law of nature, yet such cumulative evidence can never rise to be a logically complete induction, while no one pretends that such uniformity is seen by the mind to be a necessary truth as the law of contradiction is so seen. The certainty that nature is uniform is not at all, and never can be, a certainty equal to the certainty that two and two make four. Therefore, science can never deny the possibility of a miracle, and this John Stuart Mill freely admitted. Dr. Temple says:—

'If a miracle were worked, science could not prove that it was a miracle, nor of course prove that it was not a miracle. To prove it to be a miracle would require not a vast range of knowledge, but absolutely universal knowledge, which is entirely beyond our faculties to obtain. To say that any event was a miracle would be to say that we knew that there was no higher law that could explain it, and this we could not say unless we knew all laws; to say that it was not a miracle would be *ex hypothesi* to assert what was false. In fact, to assert the occurrence of a miracle is simply to go back to the beginning of science, and to say: Here is an event which we cannot assign to that derivative action to which we have been led to assign the great body of events; we cannot explain it except by referring it to direct and spontaneous action, to a will like our own will. Science has shown that the vast majority of events are due to derivative action regulated by laws. Here is an event which cannot be so explained, any more than the action of our own free will can be so explained. Science may fairly claim to have shown that miracles, if they happen at all, are exceedingly rare. To demonstrate that they never happen at all is impossible, from the very nature of the evidence on which science rests.'

He does not, however, by any means intend to affirm that reason could never force us to recognise a miracle, should a striking miraculous event take place. His view accords in this matter with common sense. All he affirms is that science—i.e. physical science *as such*—cannot affirm the miraculous. The reference to 'will' and 'derivative action' in the passage just quoted leads us to the final question concerning the origin of scientific belief. Although the area in which we observe the regularity of nature's activities is indefinitely more extensive than that in which we can observe the causes of such activities, yet to observe and disentangle the actions of co-acting or conflicting causes is the main object of all science. The idea of causation is at the root of scientific belief. What, then, is the origin of this idea? As we have said, men mean something more than 'invariable sequence' when they speak of 'cause and effect.' An idea of 'force,' and of some 'transmitted virtue,' is therein included. No one now pretends that such 'force' and 'virtue' can be perceived by our senses in any of the actions of the external world. Its origin, then, must lie within ourselves, and it lies in our perception of our own personal activity. The conception of force or power is derived from the consciousness of our own power, both as spontaneously exercised, and yet more when we experience resistance to our efforts. Hence, in our infancy, as in the infancy of mankind, the whole world seems to be peopled with 'persons,' because

everything that we observe to move is personified. 'A secret 'will moves the wind, the sun, the moon, the stars, and each 'is independent of the others.' This is so because spontaneous motion is taken as the sign of life, and all inanimate things, when known to be such, are held to be moved, if they move at all, by a force outside themselves. 'Their own 'force is limited to that of resisting, and does not include 'that of originating motion, though they are observed to be 'capable of transmitting it.' Thus, we come to the notion of a derivative force in power, the action of which is nothing more than the continuance of preceding action, and the characteristic of this derivative force is seen to be its regularity, as that of self-originating force is spontaneity.

The mode of origin * of this root-idea of cause and force, the fact that it originates within ourselves, that its knowledge only becomes possible to us through our knowledge of our own permanence, gives us the notion of a something permanent in the world around us—a notion necessary for the very existence of physical science. Here, then, we have explained the origin and nature of *scientific belief*. Our voluntary activity is the root whence springs the conception both of spontaneous activity or cause, and of that derivative, transmitting action which concurs with experience to impress on us a persuasion of the continuous uniformity of nature.

The origin and nature of religious belief has also its root

* Dr. Temple gives incidentally an interesting explanation of our tendency to regard as especially satisfactory the explanation of phenomena by their reference to 'modes of motion.' He traces it also to the fact that our scientific notions originate from the perception of our own motor activity. There is, so far as we know, no other power in us to affect external nature except our power of setting something in motion. We can move our limbs, and by so doing move other things. But except by originating motion we cannot act at all. Accordingly, throughout all science the attempt is made to reduce all phenomena to motions. 'Sounds, colours, heat, chemical action, electricity, we are perpetually endeavouring to reduce to vibrations or undulations, that is, the motion of some sort or other. The mind seems to find a satisfaction when a change of whatever kind is shown to be, or possibly to be, the result of movement.' This satisfaction, however, being thus due to a mere subjective prejudice, it follows that to explain such things as sensation and thought by motion, is by no means necessarily a true explanation. Such a mere feeling, then, affords no valid ground for disregarding that result of rational reflection which shows us that to explain mind by motion is indubitably less rational than to explain motion by mind.

in one's voluntary activity, but regarded from another point of view; not as a source of power, but as deserving of either praise or blame. We say it has its 'root' because we do not mean that the historical origin of religion was of necessity consciously ethical, any more than the historical origin of science was of necessity consciously self-introspective and reflex. What we mean is that in either case this internal voluntary action is the hidden source to which both science and religion can be—logically must be—traced. That aspect of voluntary action which gives rise to religion is its moral aspect. However rudimentary may be at first our perception respecting its moral character, yet that perception ultimately speaks to us of a supreme moral law, unchanged throughout all space and all time, not relying on external observations and inductions, but addressing itself directly to our minds, and speaking with an authority entirely its own and absolute. There is one expression used by Dr. Temple which is more or less ambiguous, and may give rise to misunderstanding. He speaks of our faculty of moral judgement as a 'spiritual' faculty, and he frequently uses the word 'spiritual' in such a way that he might be taken to imply that we had some other faculty for the perception of moral truths in addition to, and distinct from, our reason. We are persuaded that so to understand Dr. Temple would be to misunderstand him, and we doubt not but that he fully agrees with us in the uncompromising assertion of reason as the one supreme faculty of man, which legitimately claims the homage and obedience of every other without exception. To depreciate reason to the profit of some supposed 'moral' or 'illative' sense would be to open the door to the most desolating of all scepticisms, and to subordinate the basis of our highest intellectual power to some mere figment of the imagination.

It is a different but analogous scepticism which supplies the most popular objection of our day to the very system which Dr. Temple upholds. We mean the popular agnosticism, which affirms that we can know nothing 'absolute,' and therefore no absolute moral truths, since all our knowledge is but relative and phenomenal. This objection is one not a whit less fatal to all science than it is to all religion, and our author meets it by a direct denial, such as its absurdity merits, and by showing that everyone who asserts such relativity may be forced to admit at least one exception to it—namely, that of his own continued existence and identity:—

'Every man amongst us passes through incessant changes. His body

changes; he may even lose parts of it altogether; he may lose all control over some of his limbs, or over them all. And there are internal as well as external changes in each man. His affections change, his practices, his passions, his resolutions, his purposes, his judgements. But through all these changes he is conscious of being still one and the same self. And he knows this; and knows it not as an inference from any observation of sense, external or internal, but directly or intuitively. . . . When a man thinks to-day of his life of yesterday, and regards himself as the same being through all the time, he does not simply mean that he cannot distinguish between the being that existed yesterday according to his memory and the being that exists to-day according to his present consciousness; he means that the being is one and the same absolutely and in itself.

Dr. Temple might have strengthened his case by following the late Dr. Ward's lead as to the absolute demonstration which memory supplies that we can know truly what is external to our present consciousness, and that therefore there can be no impossibility in our knowing an objective world of 'things in themselves,' since amongst such things are our own past states of existence.

The word 'intuitively,' in the above-cited passage, may also possibly give rise to misunderstanding. It is truly asserted by agnostics that we do not and cannot know by direct intuition our own substantial and continuous being, apart from some passing states of consciousness; but, as has been clearly shown by Mr. St. George Mivart* (who, we believe, first called attention to the point, and whose elucidation has never been refuted by any agnostic), that what we directly perceive in 'self-action' is doing, being, and suffering, and that it is by a reflex action of the mind that we perceive both (1) our state of consciousness, and (2) our own continued existence, as also that we can have no greater certainty as to the former—our certainty as to which no one disputes—than we can have as to the latter, which, indeed, is the prior of the two.

Our conviction of our personal identity is further confirmed by the very moral perception we are now considering, for only through such identity can we be responsible for our actions. If we changed as fast as the phenomena of our being, our responsibility for any deed would cease with its commission, for no man could be justly punished for the faults of a totally different person.

But Dr. Temple directs our attention to the very important consideration that the moral law not only demands of us

* Mivart's 'Lessons from Nature,' 1876, p. 17.

obedience to its commands, but also a recognition of its essential and universal supremacy, and its absolute claim to our reverence. 'The voice within gives its command in two forms; it commands our duty, and it commands our faith. It awakes a peculiar sentiment . . . the sentiment of reverence.' It commands the pursuit of that to which this sentiment attaches, and this is the positive test of what should be our highest aim, while we may correct it by a negative test, that of universality. 'The moral law in its own nature admits of no exceptions. If a principle of action be derived from this law, it has nothing to do with time, or place, or circumstances; it must hold good in the distant future, in planets or stars utterly remote, as fully as it holds good now and here.'

As to the radical distinctness of our ethical perception from any feelings of our lower nature and any modification of merely animal faculties, Dr. Temple observes :

'No analysis succeeds in obliterating the fundamental distinction between moral and physical law; or in enabling us to escape the ever-increasing sense of the dignity of the former, or in shutting our ears to the still small voice which is totally unlike every other voice within or without. To bring the moral law under the dominion of science, and to treat the belief in it as nothing more than one of the phenomena of human nature, it is necessary to treat the sentiment of reverence which it excites, the remorse which follows on disobedience to its commands, the sense of its supremacy, as delusions. It is always possible so to treat these things, but only at the cost of standing lower in the scale of being.'

The necessarily absolute distinction between ethical judgements and all other judgements or feelings has, however, been more forcibly and pithily put by Mr. Arthur Balfour* thus :—All our knowledge is either self-evident or is legitimately deduced from what is self-evident; and this, of course, applies to our ideas of right and wrong, as well as to all the rest of our knowledge. Now, if any act is deemed 'right,' the proposition which declares it to be right must either be self-evident or must be deduced from other propositions as to what is right, one of which at least must be self-evident, or else we can have no basis whatever for our knowledge. In other words, the general propositions which lie at the root of any ethical system must themselves be ethical. This truth cuts the ground from under, and renders impossible, the view that 'a judgement as to moral obligation' can ever have been

* See his 'Defence of Philosophic Doubt,' p. 337.

evolved from mere 'likings and dislikings,' or from 'feelings of preference for tribal instincts over individual ones.'

The ethical faculty, once imparted, is of course itself abundantly capable of evolution and progress; but the ethical *principle* is *itself* essentially incapable of evolution in its origin, though it is otherwise as to those lower powers of sensuous perception and feeling which we now share with the lower animals. As Dr. Temple says:—

'They, too, can love; can be angry or pleased; can put affection above appetite; can show generosity and nobility of spirit; can be patient, persevering, tender, self-sacrificing; can take delight in society; and some can even organise it, and thus enter on a kind of civilisation. The dog and the horse, man's faithful servants and companions, show emotions and affections rising as far as mere emotions and affections can rise to the human level. Ants show an advance in the arts of life well comparable to our own. . . . And if their nature is capable of evolution, so too should ours be. And the study of such evolution of our own nature is likely to be of the greatest value. It is good to study the evolution of humanity. But all this does not touch the ethical faculty itself, nor the moral law which that faculty proclaims to us. The essence of that law is its universality; and out of all this development, when carried to its very perfection, the conception of such universality cannot be obtained. Nothing in this evolution ever rises to the height of a law which shall bind even God himself, and enable Abraham to say, "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" The very word right in this its fulness of meaning cannot thus be used.'

Evolution may lead the irrational creature to express what is hateful and what is loveable, what is painful and what is delightful, what is to be feared and what is to be sought. Evolution may lead man, with his power of ethical perception, to ever clearer and clearer moral views, as generation learns from generation.

'But the principle of the moral law, its universality, its supremacy, cannot come out of any development of human nature any more than the necessity of mathematical truth can so come. It stands not on experience, and is its own evidence. Nor, indeed, have any of the attempts to show that everything in man is the product of evolution even touched the question how this conception of universal supremacy comes in. It is treated as if it were an unauthorised extension from our experience to what lies beyond all experience. This, however, is to deny the essence of the moral law altogether; that law is universal or it is nothing.'

The acceptance of the teaching thus borne in on our minds by the moral law is the beginning of all real religion, and leads to the steps or grades in natural religion which the Bishop distinguishes as the lower and the higher faith.

‘Enlightened by the moral law, we can see strongly marked traces of its working in all things. The beauty, the order, the general tendency of all creation accords with the supremacy of the moral law over it all. But that is by no means all. We see, and we know that we see, but an infinitesimal fraction of the whole. And the result of this partial vision is that, while there is much in things around us which asserts, there is also much which seems to deny altogether any supremacy whatever in the moral law. The universe, as we see it, is not holy, nor just, nor good, nor right. The music of creation is full of discords as yet altogether unsolved. And if we look to phenomena alone, there is no solution of the great riddle. But, in spite of all imperfections and contradictions, the voice within, without vouchsafing to give us any solution of the perplexity, or any sanction but its own authoritative command, imperatively requires us to believe that holiness is supreme over unholiness, and justice over injustice, and goodness over evil, and righteousness over unrighteousness.’

To believe this is ‘the lower faith.’ It is this which inspires confidence that all present injustices shall be ultimately redressed, and which supplies strength to the hope of immortality;

‘for though it cannot be said that the immortality of the individual soul is of necessity involved in a belief in the supremacy of the moral law, yet there is a sense, never without a witness in the soul, that all would not be according to justice if a being to whom the moral law has been revealed from within is nevertheless in no degree to share in the final revelation of the superiority of the moral law over what is without.’

But this faith in the absolute supremacy of the moral law—this lower faith—necessarily tends to lead us on to another and higher faith.

‘For the supremacy of the moral law must be a moral, not merely a physical, supremacy. In claiming supremacy at all, the moral law does not assert that somehow by a happy accident, as it were, all things turn out at last in accordance with what is in the highest sense moral. The supremacy of the moral over the physical involves in its very nature an intention to be supreme. It is not the supremacy of justice, if justice is done as the blind result of the working of machinery, even if that be the machinery of the Universe. In our very conception of a moral supremacy is involved the conception of an intended supremacy. And the moral law in its government of the world reveals itself as possessing the distinctive mark of personality—that is, a purpose and a will. And thus, as we ponder it, this eternal law is shown to be the very Eternal Himself, the Almighty God. . . . The more we keep before us the true character of that law, the more clearly do we see that the moral law is not His command but His nature. He does not make that law; He is that law. Almighty God and the moral law are different aspects of what is in itself one and the same. To hold fast to this is the fullest form of faith. To love by

duty is in itself rudimentary religion. To believe that the rule of duty is supreme over the universe is the first stage of faith. To believe in Almighty God is the last and highest.'

This, in our opinion, is a truly admirable exposition of the groundwork and essence of all religion, and forms a full and adequate support for the moral sustenance and mental vigour, not only of individual and family life, but for a full and healthy national existence also.

Our author concludes this branch of his subject by one more reflection:—As natural religion reposes upon and finds its justification only in our ethical perception, so any revelation made to us by a higher power can only appeal to and be recognised by that same faculty. Even if such a revelation be believed in or confirmed by several signs and portents, such things are, and must ever be, but secondary. The ethical perceptive faculty can alone receive and judge of whatever professes to be a revelation, and such revelation must command the assent of that faculty for its continued support no less than for its original acceptance, and—as Bishop Temple, with judicious candour, tells us—'if it cannot do that, no evidence can maintain it in its place.'

Thus religion and science have a common origin in our own voluntary action, and yet the possibility of conflict between them begins at the very commencement of their existence; for the perception of our moral obligation is the assertion of our moral freedom. In a world in which there were no creatures endowed with a free will, there would be no such thing as either right doing or wrong doing, no conscience, no duty, and no faith. Yet science from its very outset ever seeks constancy, unity, and law, the extension of the range of physical causation, and the ever wider recognition of the uniformity of nature.

But science can never hope to reduce all phenomena to unity if one whole class of phenomena—human voluntary actions—are to be shut out from the domain of law.

'The evidence for the absolute uniformity of nature seems to be shaken when it is found that there is so important a part of phenomena to which the law of uniformity cannot be applied. If a human will can thus interfere with the law of uniformity, there enters the possibility that behind some phenomena may lurk the interference of some other will. Religion, on the other hand, tells every man that he is responsible, and how can he be responsible if he is not free? If his action be determined by something which is not himself, how can the moral burden of it be put on him? To tell a man that he is to answer for it if he does something which he is tempted to do is unmeaning, if he has no power to prevent himself from doing it.'

Moreover the modern doctrine of determinism is especially obnoxious to this objection, and it is in vain that the dicta of Calvinistic theologians are cited (as they sometimes are cited) to show that determinism is not necessarily intolerable to the religious instinct; for, as Dr. Temple points out, between the compulsion due to a Divine foreknowledge which has arranged everything by supreme will and a compulsion due to the unrelaxing grasp of a blind and utterly unintelligent mechanism there is a difference of life and death.

‘To have no liberty because of being absolutely in the hands of Almighty God is quite another thing from having no liberty, and being under the dominion of a dead iron rule. It seems possible to accept the one and call it an unfathomable mystery; but to accept the other is to call life a delusion and the moral law a dream.’

So strong is the ethical argument against determinism that it might well claim alone to balance any weight of scientific probability against it. But it does not stand alone; for we have in support of it our consciousness, which tells that in our voluntary actions our preference is not forced upon us by any action external to us, as also that when several motives are acting on us simultaneously and drawing us in different directions, it is none of these motives which produce the determination which it affirms to be our *own act* in the exercise of a new force, distinct from the force of the motives. And against all this, what have the determinists to say for their position which it is absolutely impossible, from the nature of the case, that they can ever prove? Nothing but an alleged absolute *à priori* impossibility the assertion of which comes with an ill grace indeed from the assertors of the relativity of all knowledge and of the impossibility of our attaining any truth save by the experience of the senses! Moreover the arguments drawn from statistics succeed, like all the other arguments for the uniformity of nature, in establishing the generality, but by no means the universality, of that uniformity. Indeed, as Dr. Temple says, it falls far short of proving as much uniformity in human action as is proved concerning the action of inanimate things:—

‘The induction which proves the uniformity of the laws of mechanics, of chemistry, of physics, is so far greater than the induction which proves the uniformity of human conduct, that it is hardly possible to put the two side by side. When we turn from abstract arguments to facts, the doctrine of necessity is unquestionably unproven.’

The advocates of determinism often make use of an argument which is singularly unfair, because by it they actually

beg the very question in dispute. They say, truly enough, that every action must have a motive, and certainly a motiveless action would be no sign of freedom of will. But they also affirm that we always act from the 'strongest motive,' while they define the 'strongest motive' as 'that which the will follows.' But we have the power of estimating motives not only by their effects, but also by their attractiveness, as experienced by our own internal feelings, and it is by this latter experience that we estimate their strength.*

The cause of determinism is, however, much aided by the exaggerations of some of those who uphold free will and represent its action as almost constant. For our truly voluntary actions form, in fact, but an exceedingly small part of our entire activity, which activity is mainly due to our organisation, to past habits, and to the influence of inclinations to which we do not and to which we have no need to advert. Moreover, the extensive part thus played by unconscious influences is highly beneficial in its effects on truly voluntary activity. It is absolutely necessary, in order that we should make any ethical progress, that we should be able by our efforts to fix certain habits in our nature, so that each upward step may be made good as it is taken, and afford a firm footing for the next ascent.

As, then, the whole procession of the physical sciences is but the orderly and legitimate evolution from the physically causative effort of the human will, which, by its spontaneous activity, gives rise to the constant and uniform activity of the irrational world it influences, so the evolution of religion is the orderly and legitimate outcome of the ethical aspects of man's will, which necessarily asserts its own volitional freedom. Indeed, as Bishop Temple says

'The freedom of the human will is but the assertion in particular of that universal supremacy of the moral over the physical in the last resort, which is an essential part of the very essence of the moral law. The freedom of the will is the moral law breaking into the world of phenomena, and thus behind the free will of man stands the power of God.'

Armed with these reflections, let us now turn to the consideration of the Bishop's next theme—the apparent conflict between religion and the doctrine of evolution. We have already somewhat anticipated this question so far as it bears on the evolution of the moral law, but it remains

* This has been pointed out by Mr. Mivart in his 'Nature and Truth.' Second Edition, 1885, p. 199.

to notice the Bishop's views respecting the other bearings of the modern belief in evolution.

He gives a very fair exposition of those natural laws and scientific discoveries which have not only led to the acceptance of that belief by the great majority of the leaders of scientific thought, but have even forced its acceptance on unwilling minds fully alive to the arguments against it, and well able to estimate their force. Yielding himself to the cumulative evidence in its favour, he points out (as we have already mentioned) that this doctrine, which at the first glance seems to deprive Paley's well-known arguments of their supposed force, does, when deeply considered, not only restore, but augment it, and that his language now requires rather supplementing than changing. Instead of a direct act of creation executing the Divine design, we have now to view that design as having been worked out by a slow process through powers implanted in matter. And that fruitful conditions were originally impressed on matter must be conceded on every hypothesis. Let the revolution of the heavenly bodies be conceded to have been naturally brought about, yet to effect this there must have been an original irregularity in the distribution of matter, otherwise no motion of rotation could ever have spontaneously arisen. Then, as to the evolution of the various species of animals and plants, the design with which creative power was exercised remains the same. He did not make the things, we may say; no, but He made them make themselves. And surely this rather adds than withdraws force from the great argument. Indeed the objection often made to Paley that he pictures the Almighty rather as an artificer than a creator thus entirely disappears. Moreover, that process which results in the survival of the fittest must tend to make life easier to live; and since the less developed creatures, as we have every reason to believe, are less sensible to pain and pleasure, and the more highly organised are better able to escape many of the evils which threaten them, it may fairly be contended that enjoyment grows with the capacity for enjoyment, while suffering tends to diminish. Thus Paley's well-known argument as to the watch can be pushed a step further; for

'we should certainly not believe it a proof that the watch had come into existence without design if we found that it produced in course of time, not merely another watch but a better. It would become more marvellous than ever if we found provision thus made, not merely for the continuance of the species, but for its improvement.'

Another fruitful subject of contemplation is the wonderful beauty of nature, which, on the hypothesis of a merely mechanical origin of things, is a phenomenon as superfluous and inexplicable as it is soul-inspiring and admirable.

'The beauty of the starry heavens, which so impressed the mind of Kant that he put it by the side of the moral law as proving the existence of a Creator, is not wanted either for the evolution of the world or for the preservation of living creatures. Our enjoyment of it is a superadded gift certainly not necessary for the existence or the continuance of our species.'

It is now often affirmed that all the beauty and perfume of flowers is due to the fact that those best endowed with such qualities have attracted thereby the fertilising visits of insects, and so transmitted the qualities in question from generation to generation in an intensified degree. In fact, however, there are many apparently necessary exceptions, and Mr. Forbes, the naturalist and traveller, has recently described a number of beautiful and complexly formed orchids discovered by him in the Indian Archipelago, which are so constructed as to be necessarily self-fertilising. Nevertheless let us admit for argument's sake that the beauty of flowers has been called forth exclusively by the agency of insects which they attract by their brightness, yet, as Dr. Temple tells us,

'the beauty of flowers is far more than mere conspicuousness of colours, even though that be the main ingredient. Why should the wonderful grace, and delicacy, and harmony of tint be added? Is all this mere chance? Is all this superfluity pervading the whole world and perpetually supplying to the highest of living creatures, and that too in a real proportion to his superiority, the most refined and elevating of pleasures, an accident without any purpose at all? If evolution has produced the world such as we see and all its endless beauty, it has bestowed on our own dwelling-place in lavish abundance and in marvellous perfection that on which men spend their substance without stint; that which they value above all but downright necessities; that which they admire beyond all except the love of duty itself. We cannot think that this is not designed, nor that the Artist who produced it was blind to what was coming out of His work.'

There is yet one other point in which the doctrine of evolution adds force, or rather rectifies and improves, the argument of Paley, for his argument on the old hypothesis of the fixity of species proved designs rather than design. It was wanting in unity and included the possibility of many designers; but evolution restores unity to the science of nature. It leaves the creation as replete as ever with intelligent purpose, while it removes the need of all abrupt action

or arbitrary interference with the course of nature. 'There is more divine foresight, there is less divine interposition; and whatever has been taken from the latter has been added to the former.'

But if science thus eliminates the need of believing in a frequent intervention of the Creator with His creation, it none the less points to a distinct starting-point, and that not only as regards the whole material universe, but even as regards the origin of life upon this planet. It is, indeed, a fact that all the evidence we possess up to the present day contradicts the opinion that life ever arises as a mere evolution from inorganic matter. Life itself, then, is one of those phenomena which science cannot explain, and one to which though, as science, it cannot affirm it to be miraculous in its origin, it is equally unable to deny a miraculous origin. Nor can we deny that there was here 'a purpose worthy of a miracle.' The very existence of the moral law seems to demand that there should be creatures capable of recognising and obeying it, and this was impossible without the imparting of life. 'In the introduction of life was wrapped up all that we value and all that we venerate in the whole creation.'

But after this distinct recognition of the miraculous by the Bishop the reader may desire to learn his views regarding the teaching of revelation as to the creation and especially as to the origin of man. As we might anticipate from Dr. Temple's antecedents, it is no narrow view, un congenial to science, which is put forth by him. The real teaching of Scripture, he tells us, is —

'that the world as we see it, and all therein contained, was created out of nothing; and that the spiritual, and not the material, was the source of all existence, . . . that the creation was not merely orderly, but progressive; going from the formless to the formed; from the orderless to the ordered; from the inanimate to the animate; from the plant to the animal; from the lower animal to the higher; from the beast to man. . . . Nothing, certainly, could more exactly match the doctrine of evolution than this. It is, in fact, the same thing said from a different point of view. . . . And when the writer of Genesis passes from creation in general to man in particular, it is still clear that he has no mission to tell those for whom he is writing by what processes man was formed, or how long those processes lasted. . . . He has to teach the essential supremacy of man among creatures, the subordination in position but equality in nature of woman to man, the original declension of man's will from the divine path, the dim and distant but sure hope of man's restoration. These are not, and cannot be, lessons in science. They are worked out into the allegory of the

Garden of Eden. But in this allegory there is nothing whatever that crosses the path of science, nor is it for reasons of science that so many great Christian thinkers from the earliest age of the Church downwards have pronounced it an allegory.'

Nothing certainly, we may add, can be more congenial to the lovers of scientific as well as moral truth than such an interpretation of Scripture as is this. But Dr. Temple offers some suggestions in the domain of physical science itself which are well worth the attention of every thoughtful biologist. There is one aspect of the causes which must co-operate in the evolution of new species which is too often slighted, if not passed over altogether. It is this circumstance which makes the Darwinian theory an incomplete theory, and which vitiates the reasoning of its most zealous supporters. As the Bishop says, the Darwinian theory

'rests on two main pillars—the transmission of characteristics from progenitor to progeny, and the introduction of minute variations in the progeny with each successive generation. . . . But what causes these variations, and what determines what they shall be? In Darwin's investigations these questions are not touched. The variations are treated as if they were quite indefinite in number and in nature. He concerns himself only with the effect of these variations after they have appeared. . . . But we are bound to look not only to their effects, but to their causes, if the theory is to be completed. And then we cannot fail to see that these variations in the progeny cannot be due to something in the progenitors, or otherwise the variations would be all alike, which they certainly are not. They must, therefore, be due to external circumstances. These slight variations are produced by the action of the surroundings, by the food, by the temperature, by the various accidents of life in the progenitors.' . . . And this 'gravely modifies the conclusions which we have to draw concerning the ancestry of any species now existing.'

It does so indeed; for it makes it probable that the same form of life—especially of the lower organisms—may have had various independent origins. The prodigality of nature in multiplying animal life makes it probable that, wherever the external surroundings were the same or nearly the same, the variations introduced would be the same or nearly the same; and it is indeed far more probable that external surroundings should be nearly the same in many places than that each spot should be absolutely unlike every other spot in those particulars. Thus in certain instances unity of plan 'would be due, not to absolute unity of ancestry, but 'to unity of external conditions at a particular epoch in the 'descent of life.'

Much as we are disposed to commend the foregoing biolo-

gical reflections, we must take exception to a certain strange view about man's physical origin—a view, so far as we know, quite peculiar to Dr. Temple, and one which, though it seems to us utterly untenable scientifically, has been selected for special eulogy by certain ecclesiastical writers.

Dr. Temple is, as a rule, transparently clear, but in this particular matter he seems to us obscure, if not confused. Thus he says :

‘To find the unity of ancestry between man and the other animals, it will certainly be necessary to go back to a point in the history of life when living creatures were as yet formless, undeveloped—the materials, as we may call them, of the animal creation as we now see it, and not, in any but a strictly scientific sense, what we mean when we ordinarily speak of animals’ (p. 175).

Now there can be simply no question but that man and the apes are, as regards corporeal structure, the closest allies; and it is no less certain that they are together separated off from all other animals by a very wide interval—such an interval that the physical difference between man and the lowest ape is trifling compared with that which exists between the lowest ape and any brute animal which is not an ape. To find, then, ‘the unity of ancestry between ‘man and the other animals,’ it will only be necessary to go back to a point from which the whole group of anthropoid animals (man and apes) had their origin; and this cannot, geologically speaking, be a point exceedingly remote, and, zoologically speaking, certainly not a point ‘when living ‘creatures were as yet formless.’

Again he says :—

‘Science does not yet assert, and there is no reason to believe that it ever will assert, that man became a fully developed animal, with the brute instincts and inclinations, appetites and passions, fully formed, an animal such as we see other animals now, before he passed on into a man such as man is now. His body may have been developed according to the theory of evolution, yet along a parallel but independent line of its own; but at any rate it branched off from other animals at a very early point in the descent of animal life’ (p. 105).

We have just urged that it could not possibly have branched off ‘at a very early point,’ and however multiple may have been the origin of any of the lower forms of life, no biologist could believe that so highly complex and specialised a form as that of the human frame attained naturally and independently a condition so extremely similar to the highly complex and specialised form of the ape, the two having all the time independently arisen from extremely low forms of life.

Moreover, what would have been the good of such an independent ancestral origin? The ancestral form of man's frame was not man. The Bishop himself speaks of it as passing on into a man. What could, then, have been the good of the ancestral animal which was *not* man being destitute of the 'brute instincts and inclinations, appetites and passions' of an animal? Is there any good in supposing the excellence of a sort of immaculate brute as the parent of the future man, supposing so grotesque an idea not to be scientifically inadmissible? The same confusion of thought is shown in the following sentence:—'The enormous gap which separates his (man's) nature from that of all other creatures known indicates 'an exceedingly early difference of origin.' But why so? That there is a wide gap between rational man and the irrational brute is clear enough; but it by no means follows that there was any such gap between the irrational brute and the physical ancestor of man when about to become rational. This small blemish in our author's work is, however, a light matter when weighed against its many solid merits; though we regret it the more because of the exceptionally reasonable view which the Bishop otherwise takes of the origin of man. He tells us that, just as he sees nothing inconsistent with the dignity of our nature in the concealment of that dignity in the helpless form of an infant in arms, so there is nothing inconsistent with his intellectual dignity or his religious aspirations, in his physical origin through evolution; for science neither asserts nor can assert

'that the higher and added life which is man's characteristic prerogative was not given to man by a direct creative act as soon as the body which was to be its seat and instrument . . . had been sufficiently developed to receive it. That the body should have been first prepared, and that when it was prepared the soul should either have been then given, or then first made to live in the image of God—this is a supposition which is inconsistent neither with what the Bible tells nor with what science has up to this time proved. . . . There is nothing in all that science has yet taught, or is on the way to teach, which conflicts with the doctrine that we are made in the Divine image, rulers of the creation around us by a Divine superiority, the recipients of a revelation from a Father in heaven, and responsible to judgement by His law. We know not how this first human soul was made, just as we know not how every human soul has been made since; but we know that we are, in a sense in which no other creatures living with us are, the children of His special care.'

Thus eloquently and powerfully has Dr. Temple sustained the claims of natural religion with temperate firmness, with

an earnestness which leaves nothing to be desired on the side of religion, and with an intelligent sympathy, with an interest in the most recent advances of knowledge, which leaves nothing to be desired on the side of science. It is these questions concerning natural religion which are the speculative questions of our generation, a generation which has lost taste for and interest in the discussion of mere confessional differences. Nevertheless, before concluding this review we must make a brief reference to Dr. Temple's mode of asserting the claims of revelation—of Christianity—on our acceptance.

To admit the fact of a *revelation* at all is to admit an interference, however small, with nature on the part of its Author, and some direct action on the course of evolution on the part of Him who has initiated that great process.

It has become distasteful to many minds to contemplate even the possibility of any such interference or direct action on the part of God, just as it has become distasteful to admit it on the part of man. For men are so constituted that completeness gives a special kind of satisfaction of its own, and a habit of specially regarding the general uniformity of nature begets a desire to assume its absolute and universal uniformity. Science and religion come into apparent collision on the question of the freedom of the will, and they come into similar collision as to the question of revelation. As the Bishop says, 'The cases are precisely parallel; in each individual man the uniformity of nature is broken to leave room for the moral force of the will to assert its independent existence.' Yet 'the demand to admit, not only the possibility, but the fact, of this breach is imperative, and to deny it is to turn the command of the moral law as revealed in the conscience into a delusion. So, too, revelation asserts its right to set aside the uniformity of nature, to leave room for a direct communication from God to man. It is an essential part of the Divine moral law to claim supremacy over the physical world. Unless somehow or other the moral ultimately rules the physical, the moral law cannot rightly claim our obedience.'

For, as we saw at starting, it is only to the moral law present in our own minds that any Divine revelation can address itself. Just as no enquirer who does not believe that God created and still governs the world will ever be convinced of the possibility of a revelation to man, so no one not keenly alive to the claims of that law will be disposed to accept it as a fact, whatever the evidence in its

favour. Revelation would defeat its own purpose 'if the 'hard-headed should have an advantage in accepting it over 'the humble-minded.' Its purpose is not to win the intellectually gifted, but the spiritually gifted. Evidence

'which no hardness of heart would be able to deny, which would convince the scientific man through his science, independently of his having any will to make holiness his aim when he had been convinced—this kind of evidence it has not pleased God to give. It is not the scientific man that God seeks as such, any more than it is the ignorant man that He seeks as such.'

It is then congruous that in such a revelation its physical evidence should not be of such a character as to stand above its moral evidence. In revealed as in natural religion it is its harmony with the voice of conscience which is its most fundamental evidence, while all other evidence is but secondary and corroborative. We have used the term 'keenly 'alive to the claims of the moral law,' because, as the Bishop says,

'it is not by any means always the man who lives the most correct life . . . but the man, even if he have many and grievous faults, who nevertheless is keenly susceptible of higher things . . . that is the man who feels the voice within most irresistible.'

Though it is impossible to say precisely how the will is concerned in belief, there is no doubt that it always takes its part. Nevertheless, no rational man however pious, however keenly he may yearn after the realisation of his highest ideal, could accept a belief which really contradicted what science had established. But, as we have seen, the absolute and universal uniformity is not so established, but only its *general* uniformity. Our own experience shows us that the general uniformity is broken for a moral purpose by our own free will. It is, however, only for such a purpose that it is broken, and it is only for such a purpose that Divine interference for the sake of a revelation is supposed to occur, and this can no more be disproved than our power of free volition can be disproved. Beyond an assertion of general uniformity science cannot go:—

'Let it be granted that the claim for freedom of the will has been often unduly pushed far beyond its limit, and let it be granted that religious professing to be revelations have included records of miracles which had no moral purpose. This does not affect the general conclusion that the evidence for uniformity has never succeeded, and can never succeed, in showing that the God who made and rules the universe never sets aside a physical law for a moral purpose, either by working through the human will or by direct action on external nature.'

The practical value of Christianity, the only professed revelation we need consider, and its concordance with human needs cannot be denied.

‘Millions have lived and died in the Christian faith since the teaching recorded in the New Testament was given, and among them have been the purest, the justest, the most self-sacrificing, the most heavenly-minded of mankind. And they all concur in saying that the one stay of all their spiritual lives has been communion with God through Christ.’

The popular philanthropy of our day would lose the surest stay were the often invisible prop of belief in Christianity removed from its support. That altruism which is now to displace the command of God is nothing but the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount, robbed of its heavenly power, robbed of the great doctrine which underlies the whole discourse.

‘There cannot be any doubt that the hold which this teaching has upon mankind has depended entirely on the extraordinary degree in which the teaching of the Bible has satisfied the conscience. Without that no miracles, however overwhelmingly attested, no external evidence of whatever kind, could have compelled intellects of the highest rank, side by side with the most uncultivated and the most barren, to accept it as Divine, nor could anything else have so often rekindled its old fire at times when faith in it had apparently withered away. The teaching of the Bible has always found, and must always find, its main evidences within the human soul.’

‘The Christian Church has been stained with many a blot. Ill deeds have been wrought in the name of Christ. Evil laws have been passed, strange superstitions have prevailed. But no other body can show such saints, no other body can produce so great a cloud of witnesses. It is certain that the lives and the deaths, the characters and the aims, of those who have trusted their all to Christ have made them what He bade them be, the salt of the earth. And they testify with one voice that they know no other power which has upheld them but the power of Christ whom they have taken for their Lord. And in the worst times within the Church there has always remained a wonderful recuperative power, which has shaken off inconsistencies and defects in the past, and will do so yet more in the future. But this recuperative power has always shown itself in one form, and in one form only—namely, a return to Christ and trust in Him.’

The Bishop’s acceptance of the doctrine of evolution is thorough. Not only natural religion, but revealed religion also, has come under the influence of its laws. He teaches a development of revealed doctrine as did Cardinal Newman in his celebrated work on that subject, only his teaching as to the course of that great process is of course very different. For our own part, we could never see how the existence of

modifications of doctrine, thus brought about, could be adduced as a valid argument against either form of religion. Just as the fact that 'Kepler grew out of Copernicus, and 'Newton out of Kepler,' cannot be used as a valid argument against the real truth of science and in support of its being a mere fancy of the human mind, so the progressive development of religion, whether natural or revealed, is no argument that religion is a purely subjective fancy.

As to Christianity, that indeed

'does not profess to be wrapped up in one Divine communication, admitting of no modifications. Though resting on Divine revelation, it is professedly a development, and is thus in harmony with the Creator's operations in nature. It is undeniable that the teaching of the Bible is quite different at the end from what it is at the beginning.'

We have thus fully admitted by the Bishop a development of doctrine different indeed from that put forward by Cardinal Newman.

'The strength of the moral sentiment in the earlier books is always assigned to the belief in, and reverence for, Almighty God. It is evidently held to be more important to believe in God and to fear Him than to see the perfection of His holiness. If we distinguish between religion and morality, religion is made the more important of the two. . . . In actual fact man began with God, to end with a clearer perception of duty. . . . The religious instinct seems to have been more indispensable for the development of humanity according to the Divine purpose than the observance of the moral law in all its fulness. . . . Hence in all the earlier stages the morality is imperfect. The profaneness of Esau is a serious offence. The ungenerous temper, the unfairness and duplicity of Jacob, are light in comparison. Truth is not an essential. . . . Women are placed below their true and natural place. . . . Slavery is allowed, and so on. The progress in the Bible is distinct. The prophets teach a higher morality than is found in the earlier books. Cruelty is condemned as it had not been before. The heathen are not regarded as outside God's love, and the future embraces them in His mercy even if the present does not. . . . Idolatry is not merely forbidden, its folly is exposed. . . . Children are not held responsible for their fathers. . . . and trust in God rises to a higher level.'

And so it has been also with Christianity itself. 'It has 'perpetually more and more cleared up the true teaching of 'the moral law. It is still continuing the same process, 'and generation after generation is better able to understand 'that teaching.' Its contrast with any antecedent natural system is great indeed. All such antecedent developments wrought out by the working of merely natural forces have perished. 'Not Socrates, nor Plato, nor Aristotle, nor the

‘Stoics, nor Philo have been able to lay hold on mankind, nor have their moral systems in any large degree satisfied our spiritual faculty.’ Revelation, and revelation alone, has taught us that great doctrine of the fatherhood of God which is at once the source and the end of all our highest and most rational efforts and aspirations. It is an undeniable fact that both the highest religious truth has been gained through evolution, and that the truth thus evolved has asserted itself and asserts itself to be a *revelation*. As Dr. Temple says :—

‘Looking back we can see that the teaching in its successive stages was a developement ; but it always took the form of a revelation. And its life was due to that fact. As far as it is possible to judge, that union between morality and religion, between duty and faith, without which both religion and morality soon wither out of human consciousness, can only be secured - has only been secured—by presenting spiritual truth in the form of a revelation.’

Though the Bishop thus uncompromisingly asserts both the need and the fact of a Divine revelation, his moderation, breadth of view, and tolerant reasonableness, with regard to its claims, are truly exemplary. Asserting again and again that revelation affirms no more startling breach of uniformity on the part of God than free will asserts on the part of man, he goes on to make certain very pregnant remarks respecting miracles themselves.

In the first place, he tells us

‘it is possible, and revelation has no interest in denying it, that the intervention which has apparently disturbed the sequence of phenomena is, after all, that of a higher physical law as yet unknown. For instance, the miraculous healing of the sick may be no miracle in the strictest sense of all. It may be but an exercise of the power of mind over body . . . not yet brought within the range of science . . . Revelation is not bound by the scientific definition of a miracle . . . and if science were some day able to show that [miraculous events recorded] could be accounted for by natural causes . . . this would not affect their character as regards the revelation . . . of which they form a part.

‘If for these purposes they have served their turn, if they have arrested attention which would not otherwise have been arrested, if they have overcome prejudices, if they have compelled belief, the fact that they are afterwards discovered to be no breach of the law of uniformity has no bearing at all on the Revelation to which they belong. The miracle would in that case consist in the precise coincidence in time with the purpose which they served, or in the manner and degree in which they marked out the Man who wrought them from all other men, or in the foreshadowing of events which are in the distant future.’

And he applies this consideration even to the miracle of Christ's resurrection.

As to the miracles of history, he says they may have been due

'not to an interference with the uniformity of nature, but to a superiority in His mental power to the similar power possessed by other men. Men seem to possess this power both over their own bodies and over the bodies of others in different degrees. Some can influence other men's bodies through their minds more, some less. . . . If this were so . . . though these acts would not be miracles for the purposes of science, they would still be miracles for the purposes of revelation. They would do their work in arresting attention, and still more in accrediting both the message and the Messenger. . . . It would still remain the fact that here was a Messenger whom God had seen fit to endow with powers which no other man ever possessed in such degree and such completeness, though others may have possessed some touch of them greater or less.'

Speaking of the miracles of the Old Testament compared with those of the New, he says, with admirable candour:—

'No *such* evidence can now be produced on their behalf. The times are remote; the date and authority of the books not established with certainty; the mixture of poetry with history no longer capable of any sure separation into its parts; and, if the New Testament did not exist, it would be impossible to show such a distinct preponderance of probability as would justify us in asking any to accept the miraculous parts of the narrative as historically true.'

Moreover he forcibly points out the dangers and evil effects of a narrow literalness.

'We look back,' he says, 'with astonishment on the Rabbinical interpretations of the Old Testament, and all the more because of the really great and true thoughts that are sometimes to be found in the midst of their fanciful conceits. We can trace the mischief they did to true religion by the perverted reverence with which they regarded the words, and even the letters and the very shapes of the letters, in which their sacred books were written. Their perversions of the law of God, their subtle refinements of interpretation, their trivial conceits, their false and misleading comments and inferences, all certainly tended to encourage the hypocrisy which our Lord rebuked, and against which St. Paul contended. But we still see something of the same spirit in the attempt to maintain a verbal, and even literal, inspiration of the whole Bible. . . . There is a serious risk that, if the mind be fastened on things external in some way connected with, but yet distinct from, the substance of Revelation, it may turn out that these external things cannot hold the ground on which they have been placed. They have to be given up by force at last, when they ought to have been given up long before. And when given up, they too often tear away with them part of the strength of faith. . . . It is distinctly the fault of

religious, not of scientific men, that there was once a great contest between the Bible and astronomy, that there has since been a great contest between the Bible and geology, that there is still a great contest between the Bible and evolution. . . . While believers have thus prepared a great stumblingblock for themselves, they have put quite as great a stumblingblock before others. For students of science informed by instant voices all around that they must choose between their science and the Bible, knowing as they did that their science was true, and supposing that the lovers and defenders of the Bible best knew what its teaching was, had no choice as honest men but to hold the truth as far as they possessed it, and to give up the Bible in order to maintain their science. It was a grievous injury inflicted on them; and though some among them might deserve no sympathy, there were some whom it was a great loss to lose.

‘Our knowledge of the true meaning of the Bible has gained, and it was intended that it should gain, by the increase of other knowledge. . . . I do not hesitate to ascribe to science a clearer knowledge of the true interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis, and to scientific history a truer knowledge of the great historical prophets. The advance of secular studies, as they are called, clears up much of the Psalms, and much in the other poetical books of Scripture. I cannot doubt that this was intended from the beginning, and that, as science has already done genuine service to religion in this way, so will it do still better service with process of time.’

We are deeply grateful for words of such wise moderation. An advocate of the cause of religion more than doubles his influence who is thus careful to confine his claims within the bounds which reason must recognise as justly claimed, and who shows himself so intelligently sympathetic with the cause of science. The arms of that See to the throne of which we gladly welcome Dr. Temple may well serve as a symbol of the conflict he has so successfully waged—one sword upheld against superstition, while the other attacks that popular scepticism which is logically no less fatal to the cause of science than it is to the interests of rational religion.

The present Bishop of London, by such work as that we are now criticising, worthily carries out the traditions of the Church of England. That Church has been long distinguished by the able and vigorous polemic it has sustained against the various forms of unbelief which have assailed it. To such honoured names as those of Addison, Clarke, Berkeley, Butler, Law, Waterland, Warburton, Lardner, and Paley we may add those of Dr. Isaac Barrow and of Cardinal Newman, for by far the most effective of the Cardinal's efforts against unbelief were written by him whilst still a member of the Established Church.

Great has been the contrast in this respect between the Church of England and the Church of France. While the former produced divine after divine who manfully struggled with and ultimately thoroughly overcame the English Deists, the French prelates, with their official supporters, supposed to be endowed with rich stores of traditional erudition, were reduced to invoking State persecutions against those to whom they could offer no convincing arguments. The corrupt Archbishop of Strasburg, Cardinal de Rohan (1781), with the Archbishops of Paris and Vienne, had to content themselves with hurling impotent anathemas against the publishers of the great edition of Voltaire's works.

The bishops and clergy in convocation assembled solemnly condemned as a tissue of revolting blasphemies Raynald's learned and laborious History of the Indies. And they reminded the King of the declaration of 1751 which ordained the punishment of death on all who printed or circulated writings hostile to religion. They did not indeed wish that such an extreme punishment should be put in force, but they energetically declared that the time had come to shake off a 'deplorable lethargy,' which was the name they gave to that toleration which in their day had supervened.

But a more striking warning to the English clergy may be drawn from the work the title of which stands last on the list at the head of this article. We have only left ourselves space to briefly refer to this really important book. It presents us with an admirable illustration of the ecclesiastical spirit most opposed to that which animates Dr. Temple's work, and is therefore peculiarly fitted to make us feel, by antithesis, the value of the latter. It is especially deserving of study by those who in the past have opposed Dr. Temple's liberalism and shown themselves but too ready to indoctrinate our people with some of the superstitions of the Vatican. The history of Galileo's condemnation has come to be generally regarded as altogether an affair of the past and one which has lost all practical interest for our generation, however much our intellectual and moral sympathies may be stirred at each fresh reference to it. All that can be said about the subject on either side we commonly suppose to have been said, and the defenders of the Pontifical authority are thought to have made out a case which, however unsatisfactory it may be, is yet supposed to afford them a loophole of escape and a means of evading any absolute refutation of papal claims.

But, in fact, the original sin of these famous anti-scientific

decrees clings to them with invincible tenacity, and the Rev. W. W. Roberts (a clergyman in Holy Orders of the Church of Rome) has unanswerably demonstrated that it does so cling. His book deserves a careful and attentive perusal, not only on the part of all Christians, whether of the 'English or the Roman obedience,' since it is nothing less than a complete demolition of the dogma of Papal infallibility as understood in any plain or ordinary sense. It demands a careful refutation from the Ultramontane party—a refutation which we venture to predict it will never receive, since the only possible way in which that party can treat it and avoid humiliating and disastrous defeat, is by a conspiracy of silence as regards the real gist of its arguments.

But one aspect of the book which has an interest for all thoughtful Englishmen is its bearing on our somewhat treatment of Scripture. If such an authority as Rome, with so strong a discipline and one so unflinchingly enforced, has failed to compel obedience even amongst her own children, how can English Churchmen hope ever effectually to restrain in narrow bonds the advance of science, not only in the field of physics, but also in that of historical and Biblical criticism? The Church of England now enjoys a magnificent opportunity, comparable with nothing less than that which lay before the Primitive Church after the great Roman Empire had ceased to be hostile to her. To our own race and to our own tongue the future of the world seems to have been committed by Divine providence. Far more widely extended than the vast British Empire itself, is extended the influence of English religious thought and feeling. This extension will be a great blessing to the world if only we can retain unimpaired in the future, as it has been unimpaired in the past, that happy mean between superstitious obscurantism and chilling unbelief which has hitherto been the prevailing religious character of our people. Inestimable as is the value of the political freedom and the solid, if slow, intellectual advance which is everywhere spreading amongst us, infinitely more inestimable is the maintenance of those fundamental principles of morality and religion which are both the true palladium of our liberties and our best defence against the assaults of whatsoever enemies. In this work on 'The Relations between Religion and Science' we hail one more aid to the maintenance of those principles, and on this account, even more than on account of its literary and intellectual merits, we desire, in concluding, to offer our sincere thanks to its right reverend author.

- ART. IX.—1. *La Réforme Maritime.* Par GABRIEL CHARMES. ‘Revue des Deux Mondes,’ tomes lxvi., lxviii. 1884, 1885.
2. *Les Torpilleurs Autonomes et l’Avenir de la Marine.* Par GABRIEL CHARMES. 12mo. Paris: 1885.
3. *A Treatise on Future Naval Battles and how to fight them.* By Admiral Sir GEORGE ELLIOT, K.C.B. Roy. 8vo. London: 1885.
4. *The Use of Torpedoes in War.* By Commander E. P. GALLWEY, R.N. ‘Journal of the Royal United Service Institution,’ vol. xxix. 1885.
5. *La Marine de Guerre, son Passé et son Avenir.* Par M. GOUGEARD, Ancien Ministre de la Marine. 8vo. Paris: 1884.
6. *Les Combats de la Rivière Min.* Par. CH. CHABAUD-ARNAULT, Capitaine de Frégate. ‘Revue Maritime et Coloniale,’ tome lxxxiv. 1885.
7. *Études Comparatives de Tactique Navale.* Par E. FARRET, Lieutenant de Vaisseau. ‘Revue Maritime et Coloniale,’ tomes lxxvi., lxxvii., lxxviii. 1883.
8. *Naval Tactics on the Open Sea with the existing Types of Vessels and Weapons.* By Captain the Hon. E. R. FREMANTLE, C.B., C.M.G., R.N. Naval Prize Essay. ‘Journal of the Royal United Service Institution,’ vol. xxiv. 1880.

THE affairs of the Navy have during the last few months engrossed so large a share of public attention that we shall not attempt to excuse ourselves for reverting to them. But as in our last number we spoke of the condition and comparative strength of our navy, so now we propose to speak of the use which may have to be made of it in time of war. It is a question which has at the present moment not only a great importance but a wide extent, covering not only the ground of naval tactics and of naval strategy, but the whole conduct of naval war. For that in everything relating to the navy the changes within the last few years have been enormous is a certainty; that changes equally great are yet before us is almost as certain; but the particular way in which these changes will affect naval war is as yet unknown; and in spite of the various theories which have been propounded with more or less authority, it will continue to be unknown, until the clash of arms finally determines it.

But notwithstanding this necessary vagueness, a consideration of the different possibilities, as they have presented themselves to some of the foremost speakers and writers, will, we think, be neither uninteresting nor useless; the more so as the greater number of our references have to be made to French essays and thus to the current of French opinion; for, so far as literature is concerned, the field of naval tactics is now, and always has been, peculiarly French.* It was, indeed, happily remarked in the early years of the present century,† that it was a gross and silly error to say, as was so often said, that we had no authorities of our own on naval tactics; that, on the contrary, certain men bearing—amongst others—such names as Hawke, Rodney, and Nelson, had composed works of the greatest and most irrefragable merit, far superior to anything that had ever emanated from the French press. That the works of these and similar authors are of the highest authority cannot be considered an open question; and, properly studied, they may be held to embody the whole theory and practice of naval war as it was known and understood up to the year 1826, when the use of shell on board ship was rendered practicable, and to the year 1848, when the adaptation of steam to ships of war opened the way to evolutions which had till then been only dimly imagined.

The extent to which these changes had modified the results of former experience was perhaps not fully realised till the Crimean war, when the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Sinope in 1853, and the repulse of the allied fleet at Sebastopol on October 17, 1854, brought rapid and general conviction of the terrible power of shell; whilst, on the other hand, the assembling of fleets which manœuvred under steam was equally convincing as to the magnitude of the change which had taken place. How rapid and decisive this conviction was can be best illustrated by recalling the fact that when the English and French fleets went up the Baltic in 1854, their numbers were largely swelled by sailing ships of the line; before the season was much more than half over, these were all sent home as a needless expense and an actual clog on any operations that might be undertaken; and in

* The ‘Studies’ of M. Farret, which we have placed at the head of this article, embody a careful summary of nearly everything that has been written on the subject of naval tactics since the publication of Sir Howard Douglas’s ‘Naval Warfare under Steam’ in 1858.

† Naval Chronicle, vol. iv. p. 227.

1855 none of the ships which went to the Baltic were altogether destitute of steam-power.

The ordinary evolutions of fleet-sailing had pointed out to many thinking men that, in case of meeting the enemy's fleet, the details of the action would be curiously different from all former experience; but as no such meeting took place, nothing was ever known of any plans which our admirals had formed. In the first year, indeed, when it was supposed to be not impossible that the Russians might dispute our presence in the Gulf of Finland, it was doubted, by men in a position to judge, whether the admiral had any plan: he certainly did not broach it to his subordinates, though the subject was privately discussed amongst the junior flag officers and the senior captains. Of some of the ideas then put forward, we have fortunately an account in the letters of Sir Henry Codrington,* a singularly calm, capable, and well-read man, trained by his father in the traditional learning of the past; and it appears that the way in which it was considered most advantageous to engage the Russian fleet, then consisting entirely of sailing ships, and supposed therefore to be in the old line of battle—that is, line ahead with the wind abeam—was to retreat before it in line abreast, or more strictly in double échelon, opening fire on the leading ships and ‘pummelling’ them into a wreck by the concentrated fire, which they ‘would be unable to compete with;’ or, if the wind was light, as during the Baltic summer it frequently was, to steam to windward slowly across the head of the enemy's line, crushing the van before it could be supported. This is perhaps the earliest suggestion in any practical form as to the tactics of a fleet under steam which has been made public, and it is also one of the latest; for though then proposed as the tactics of a fleet of steamers against a fleet of sailing ships, a similar method of retreat in indented line abreast before a column of ships or groups in line ahead is still spoken of not only as a possible but as a highly effective measure, and more especially if the fleet formed in line abreast has even a slight advantage in speed. The head of the pursuing column must, it is argued, be crushed, or—in Sir Henry Codrington's words of thirty years ago—be pummelled into a wreck, by the concentrated fire of many ships ranged across its line of advance.

* Selections from the Letters (private and professional) of Sir Henry Codrington, Admiral of the Fleet, edited by his sister Lady Bouchier (privately printed, 1880), pp. 392–397.

The Russian war, however, passed away without throwing any experimental light on the science of naval tactics; though out of the experience of the fleets in front of the forts of Sebastopol sprang the idea of plating the ships with impenetrable armour. The idea was not, indeed, by any means a new one; but as often as it had sprung up in former days, so often had it been consigned to oblivion, for want of the ability to give it effect. It was not till it was again born after the improvements in machinery rendered the manufacture of plates practicable, that ironclad ships took form—if, indeed, the earliest types could be said to have form—and developed, at first by very slow degrees, into the ships of the present day. During this process of development and change, the ideas on naval tactics have been also changing, and, in the minds of many, have been and are in a state of chaotic confusion. This is certainly a false view; there is no reason to doubt that the subject has been studied with the care and attention of which it is worthy, by many amongst the senior officers of our own or other navies, the men who in time of war will have the command of fleets; even though their sense of responsibility or their desire not to betray themselves to any possible enemy may have prevented their making any public exposition of their conclusions.

There can be no doubt that in this matter reticence is wisdom. During the whole of last century our admirals were tied and bound by a pernicious code of ‘Fighting Instructions,’ which they departed from at their peril; and, what was still worse, these Instructions, being distinctly formulated and printed by authority, were as well known to the French admirals as they were to the English. A French admiral meeting an English fleet could commonly depend on its engaging, or endeavouring to engage, in the prescribed manner, and had long before made up his mind as to the best means of defence. It was thus that, more often than is pleasant to remember, the French were able to thwart our attack, and, whilst standing strictly on the defensive, to win a tactical and still more a strategical advantage.

The Fighting Instructions having been happily broken down and abolished, the Admiralty are now especially guarded against falling for a second time into a similar mistake, and commit themselves to nothing which can be interpreted into a command or even an official recommendation of any one system of tactics, or of any one mode of attack. The same caution is exercised in France; and thus, in both countries,

whilst regulations have been laid down as to the manner in which a fleet is to be organised, they are such as to leave a very wide discretion to the commander-in-chief, both as to the details of the organisation and as to the manner in which it is to be applied. Our English Admiralty have gone even further. They have steadfastly refused to admit any exposition of naval tactics, properly so called, into the course of study at Greenwich; for any such exposition, it has been thought, would carry with it a certain weight of authority, and might lead to mischief. And, indeed, it is not long since that one of our admirals, who has perhaps had more experience with fleets and squadrons than any other officer now serving, spoke to this effect:—

‘It is often asked, What is to be our fighting formation in future? None has been prescribed: it is to be hoped that none will be prescribed. To prescribe any would be exceedingly foolish and in a high degree presumptuous. Foolish; for all our past history shows the evil of having a prescribed formation for fighting in; it needed the genius of a Nelson to disentangle us from the mess. Foolish; for, unless perhaps the state of his enemy’s bunkers, there are few things an admiral would give more to know beforehand than the formation in which his enemy was going to fight. Presumptuous; because, in the present day, we have no practical experience of naval battles, and have no business to speak with authority. . . . The French profess, quite openly, to prefer the indented line abreast as a battle formation. We are led to suppose that, should the occasion arise, they mean to fight in it, and trust largely to their rams: our plans may be laid accordingly: but we must always bear in mind that, when the time comes, they may do something very different from what we have taught ourselves to expect. It is their business to deceive us; and it is our business to expect them—or any other enemy—to do, not what we are best prepared for, but whatever may happen to be most disagreeable and is likely to be most dangerous to us. We may please ourselves by hoping that our enemy will act in the way we want him to do: we ought never to lose sight of the probability of his acting in that particular way which we do not want him to do.’*

So considered, then, the numerous essays describing or

* We are here quoting from our notes of a too short course of lectures ‘On Exercising Squadrons,’ delivered at Greenwich in the spring of 1882 by Sir Geoffrey Hornby, then President of the Royal Naval College.

discussing the fighting formation of the future are without authority, without the sanction of experience, and are nothing more than the expressions of private opinion or the speculations of earnest but irresponsible students, which may, indeed, show the current of professional thought, but cannot be held as offering any exact indication of the conduct of a naval action. Of manœuvring single ships, of duels, and of Captain Colomb's war game, much has been spoken; and the discussions, by inducing officers to study the capabilities of ships and to aim at a correct estimate of the effect of certain evolutions, cannot but lead them to form definite opinions on points on which, when in command, they may be called on to decide at a moment's notice. They are, in fact, discussions on seamanship in its more scientific phase, and may lead to conviction, or, as in the case of the war game, to some measurable standard of results. But fighting formations of fleets or squadrons cannot be so discussed or so measured; they can only be stated or described, and there is thus room for very wide differences of opinion. Line abreast, line ahead, and échelon have all their supporters: others maintain that these are too extended, and advocate some more compact formation, whether of indented lines or groups. Some writers prefer a broad front, as permitting the freer use of the ram; others prefer a deep formation on a narrow front, suggesting that the broadside fire of several ships closely following each other has some analogy to the withering broadside of an old three-decker. Something may be said on behalf of all; and it is utterly impossible to say that circumstances may not render any one advisable. From one contention only we strongly dissent. It has been said, it is now repeated by Sir George Elliot, that 'after fleets first meet, the battle will become a *'mêlée'*—a series of single and independent encounters. It would, indeed, be remarkable if the latest development of naval war should be this utter annihilation of naval tactics. We are, on the contrary, convinced that in the future, more than ever, the great tactical principle must never be lost sight of—that of concentrating a superiority of force at some one point. This is what has been spoken of as the tactical game of two to one; but it is a game without which no tactical advantage is possible, whatever advantage may be gained from other sources. As chairman of a meeting at the United Service Institution in March 1881, Sir Geoffrey Hornby said:—

'Recognising the difficulty there is in forming any system of tactics

at the present moment, we should be very careful to adhere to principles, and to stick to those laid down as principles of war by our own admirals, notably by Lord Nelson. One of his principles was this, Double on your enemy. Doubling is simply this, that you take one part of the enemy's squadron in detail first. Lord Nelson, when he was attacking at the battle of the Nile, overwhelmed the van of his enemy; at Trafalgar, he sent his ships in two columns, destroying the centre of his enemy, and then proceeded to deal with the van and rear. . . . Admiral Randolph has complained that our ships cannot work together because they are not homogeneous. Now, we cannot expect to have a brand-new fleet every year; we must make use of the fleet we have got. We therefore come to the principle which Admiral Dowell laid down, and which is most important, that the ships should be paired or joined together in threes, formed into separate bodies according to the nature of the ships, not according to the seniority of the captains. . . . Considering the difficulty experienced in action owing to the confusion, the smoke, and so on, it will be very difficult for an admiral to command each of his ships; and if he can rely on the very able men he has around him, by selecting the ablest and putting him in charge of two or three, as he may think best, he would get the best results. The captains in command of such groups, though they might not be able to see the signals of the admiral, would still dispose of a large force, and if they only succeeded in throwing it upon one of the enemy's ships they would carry out Lord Nelson's principle. I think, as we have these ships, all we have to do is to use them.*

This, from an officer who speaks with the high authority of Sir Geoffrey Hornby, is a strong attestation of the tactical value of the system of groups; and though Sir Geoffrey only instances it as one way of overcoming the difficulty caused by having a fleet composed of a number of ships of very opposite types—such as 'Agincourt,' 'Invincible,' 'Glatton,' and 'Inflexible'—it is still clear that, in his opinion, it would be, in other cases also, at least a possible basis for organisation. Of the number of ships which should compose a group, he refuses to speak positively. 'A group,' he says, 'is officially defined as "a small body of ships united under "one leader." The further detail is for the admiral to determine for himself. It is not difficult to put three ships effectively on one: it is of course easier to put two: more difficult to put four. So long as we are impressed with the idea of what Nelson taught us, the importance of massing against an inferior number, it does not much matter: three to one is very good; four to one may sometimes be better.'

It is well known that the completeness of Nelson's suc-

* Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, vol. xxv. p. 371.

cesses, depending on the strict accuracy with which his theory was reduced to practice, was to a great extent due to the friendly relations which existed amongst the responsible officers in every fleet under his orders. Of the captains who fought at the Nile he used habitually to speak as 'the band of brothers;' and a few days before Trafalgar, Captain Duff, who fell in the battle, wrote to his wife:—'He (Nelson) is so good and pleasant a man that we all wish to do what he likes. I have been myself very lucky with most of my admirals, but I really think the present the pleasantest I have met with.' But this power of winning men's affections and securing their cordial co-operation was a part of Nelson's genius. Failing that, system must be called into play. On this point also we are able again to quote Sir Geoffrey Hornby. He says:—

'Nothing makes a fleet so strong as mutual confidence between admirals and captains, and that ought to be cultivated by all means. The result is this—and I am now speaking from experience—if you are to have mutual confidence you must be a long time together. Mutual confidence is more engendered by your getting into difficulties and getting successfully out of them than by anything else. You cannot help making mistakes, but it is the person who when a mistake is made pulls his friend through, or is pulled through by his friend, that imparts or imbibes most confidence; and there is nothing so good as that mutual confidence. If that is to be done, you can only get at it by people serving long together, and that is going dead against the principle which appears to hold so much favour at present at Whitehall. At the end of three years, ruthlessly, every captain is taken out of his ship, however good he may be; and they are now talking about having a new admiral in the Channel Squadron every two years.* I think we ought to look round and see what are the principles of successful action adopted elsewhere. There has been no greater success obtained in late years than that of the German armies. Do they adopt in the German armies a principle of that kind, or one exactly opposite? I take it, it is one exactly the opposite. We never heard of Count Moltke suggesting that an able general should be removed so as to give an opportunity for somebody else to become efficient; on the contrary, their generals are retained, and when they are tested in war they are found efficient. I think what we should do is to try and select the ablest men and give them every opportunity to continue at sea and to serve together, so that we may make the best possible use of our men.'†

This was spoken four years ago: but though it is impos-

* This has since been more than talked about: it has been tried, and even exaggerated, for the last admiral of the Channel Squadron held the command for only one year.

† Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, vol. xxv. p. 372.

sible to doubt that Sir Cooper Key is perfectly well aware of the importance of establishing and cultivating to the highest possible extent this mutual confidence between admirals and captains, the pressure of professional, of political, or of family interest, or other causes, have proved, and will probably continue to prove, sufficient to prevent the adoption of any such measure as that recommended by Sir Geoffrey Hornby.

We have hitherto been speaking of a naval engagement as between capital ships, such as form the boasted strength of our own, of the French and Italian navies. It would, however, be vain to deny that the power and effectiveness of such ships are honestly doubted by many young officers in the van of professional opinion; and that this doubt, accepted as a certainty by writers of no distinct qualification, has been urged in language which, even in its wildness, must furnish matter for careful and serious consideration. By some of these, and in a very special degree by M. Gabriel Charmes, it is most uncompromisingly maintained that the days of ironclads are past; that to build more is waste of labour and money; and, in fact, that the best thing that could be done with those already existing would be to break them up and sell them for old iron. The large guns share the same verdict: they are useless and costly encumbrances. With regard to these, indeed, the question is rather a curious one; for, for the last fifteen years, naval opinion, in this country at least, has continued to repeat its profound mistrust of the policy of limiting the armament of a ship to two, or four, or any very small number of monster guns. Guns of 80 or 100 tons weight are undoubtedly weapons of enormous power: where their shot strikes, it penetrates or crushes. But they are necessarily few in number, and the firing of them is a work of time. If they miss, their great size and power do no harm, and the battle may be over before they can be fired a second time; and thus, when we consider the chances of missing involved by the motion of the ship which carries the gun, the motion of the ship aimed at, and the want of nerve, cool precision, and accuracy in the man who fires, 'we shall find,' says Captain Noel, 'the value of the system of a few heavy guns reduced to a very narrow limit.' Admiral Fremantle, speaking to the same effect, says, 'those who fire the largest number of shots must have the greatest number of chances;' and so long ago as 1871, Captain Colomb said, 'It does appear to me a matter of very serious consideration whether this struggle

‘after guns which will pierce the heaviest plates at long range has not overshot itself; whether the point has not already been passed at which the reduction in the number of shot which can be fired per minute is compensated by the increased power of the gun.’*

Quite recently again, it has been argued that, since no armour can be considered proof against the largest and heaviest guns; that the shot from these are very likely not to hit; but that if they do hit the armoured side of a ship, more especially if they do not penetrate, they scatter through the inside of that ship such a storm of langrage, in the shape of bolts and fragments, that no living thing could survive, the best defence is to have no armour at all, in which case the shot from the large guns, if they strike, will go in at one side of the ship and out at the other, doing comparatively little mischief. So stated, this is of course a paradox; for as soon as it was understood that armour was done away with, there would be an immediate return to small guns and many of them; and, as in the days of old, a ship would be battered by a large number of guns, small, indeed, in comparison with some now afloat, but sufficiently big to do a vast amount of damage; or again, as has been happily urged by M. Weyl in a singularly interesting and able *résumé* of the whole subject,† the gunmakers would speedily introduce guns throwing comparatively light shell of enormous size with low velocity. One of these, filled with powder or inflammable composition, would be sufficient to reduce any unarmoured vessel to a helpless or blazing wreck. In the face of such possibilities, armour is not likely to disappear altogether; but it is, nevertheless, by no means improbable that, in their continued developement, the fire of Nordenfelts, of the quick-firing 6-pounder, or of perhaps larger guns on the same principle, or of Maxim guns, may become so deadly through the ports, even of turrets, that it may be beyond human endurance effectively to work the great guns, and that, as these are silenced, the necessity for very thick armour will disappear.

All this, however, is not the contention of M. Charmes and other writers to whose essays we have alluded. On the contrary, their idea practically amounts to the abolition of

* Brassey's 'British Navy,' vol. iii. pp. 414-19.

† Questions Maritimes: La Marine de Guerre; la Cuirasse et le Canon; Expériences récentes et Conclusions. Par Em. Weyl, Lieutenant de vaisseau en retraite. 8vo 1885.

ships, guns, rams, everything, in fact, that constitutes a navy such as we now understand it, and to the waging war at sea by a countless number of torpedo-boats. M. Charmes calls this '*La Réforme Maritime*;' what he proposes is nothing less than a complete and absolute revolution. The pamphlet and articles in which he has propounded this system are written with an ease and fluency of language, and with an offhand assumption of infallibility or incontrovertibility, which tempt the careless reader to yield a startled assent to the propositions put before him. It is only when he has laid the book down and reflects on what he has read, that he begins to realise the fact that M. Charmes's idea is not altogether original, and that the manner of war which he has so glowingly described is compounded in nearly equal portions of the historical practice of the Iroquois and the fabled achievements of Major Gahagan. The practice of the Iroquois; for the horrors of war are to fall principally on the undefended and the defenceless, on women and children: the achievements of Major Gahagan; for success is to be won with the minimum of force against countless odds, always, however, with the proviso, as we understand, that the minimised force is French; the English, so far as we are able to gather, are quite unequal to such warfare.

According to this theory, the first and most important element of strength is weakness; and war is to resolve itself into a series of ambushades, night attacks and explosions, in which size, armour, armament, numbers, and watchfulness, so long as they are English, are to be at the mercy of the enemy, small, unnoticed, and bearing a torpedo, if only it is French. In presence of the tsetze fly of France, the English bull can no longer exist. It is necessary to specify the nationality of the giant and the giant-killer, for M. Charmes, who writes with a malevolence which we are apt to persuade ourselves belongs wholly to the past, scarcely considers the possibilities of naval war except as between France and England; and the ideal navy which France will oppose to England, is to consist entirely of torpedo-boats, gunboats, and cruisers: the former are to destroy our ships of war; the latter are to destroy our merchant ships and our undefended towns. There is to be no fighting; merely destruction: for, from M. Charmes's point of view, ships of war, merchant ships, and open towns, provided only that they are English, are equally incapable of offering any resistance. It is thus he describes part of his scheme:—

'On our cruisers, as on all our other ships, everything approaching to armour is to be done away with. There is no question of equip-

ping them for fighting, but simply and solely as scourers of the sea, meant only to attack the weak and defenceless. They have no need of heavy guns: two of 14 c.m. ($5\frac{1}{2}$ -inch) are sufficient, and as many Hotchkiss guns as possible. For defence, in case of emergency, they will carry also two torpedo tubes. Everything is to be sacrificed to speed, which is indispensable, no less for flying from an armed enemy than for pouncing on an unarmed one. In sea-going trim they must be able to steam twenty knots at least. They are not fighting ships; they will have no armoured deck—as proposed by M. Gougeard—but will carry the weight of it in additional coal; their field of action and destruction will thus be extended; they will have little or no need of entering port to refit. They will supply their wants from their prizes, and, after taking out of them their provisions and coal, will sink them without pity, so as not to encumber themselves with their captures. The crews they can turn adrift from time to time as opportunity offers. But they will take especial care not wilfully to expose themselves to danger. If attacked by torpedo or gun boats, they will seek safety in flight; and on no account will they be guilty of the imprudence of coming within reach of any fortified place on shore. Such ships will be our blockade-runners, our “*Alabamas*,” but “*Alabamas*” resolved not to repeat the folly of their glorious model by accepting battle. They will each cost something more than two millions (80,000*l.*) Fortunately, it will not be necessary to have many of them, for the great ocean highways are not more than ten in number, and it is on these only that our cruisers are intended to act.’

All this seems very simple—on paper: we may doubt whether, in practice, it would be quite so much a matter of course as M. Charner presupposes. For the moment, we will even leave on one side the international difficulties which might result from the wholesale destruction of possibly neutral property: still, from the purely naval point of view, we may remark that there are many merchant ships which should be quite equal to contend with and overpower enemies such as these cruisers are described: that, besides, ships’ bottoms do, in course of time, get foul; and the speed of twenty knots might very well be found, at a critical moment, to have dwindled down to fifteen, to twelve, or even to ten. Again, accidents will happen; machinery will get out of order; coal and provisions will run short; and prizes, adequately supplied, may be shy. There are thus many possibilities adverse to M. Charner’s suggestion to which, as it seems to us, he has not given full weight, if, indeed, he has considered them at all.

It is so much the fashion, and especially in France, to instance the ‘*Alabama*’ as having done against the Northern States of America what it is here proposed to do against England, that it is worth while to examine the ‘*Alabama*’s’ cruise, not from a political or mercantile point of view, but from a

naval, and to enquire into the means by which she was able to extend her depredations over a period of nearly two years.

It will be remembered that the 'Alabama,' a properly built ship of war—not an old packet-boat, as M. Gougeard has described her—was able, in the first instance, to escape to sea and to be commissioned, by a lax interpretation of a very indefinite point of international law, such as is not likely to occur again. Her appearance at sea as a Confederate cruiser, August 24, 1862, was thus of the nature of an accident, against which the Northern States were scarcely warned, and not at all prepared. Thus beginning her cruise with exceptional advantages and in a crowded sea, she captured and destroyed some twenty merchant vessels within the first two months. She had not, however, been able to replenish her bunkers; they were getting empty, so she went to the West Indies, where, at Martinique, November 1862, coal, sent from England, was waiting for her. In January she coaled in a similar manner in the Bay of Campeachy; and after her engagement with the 'Hatteras' put into Port Royal of Jamaica, where she refitted. She then went on the coast of Brazil, where she remained several months, making her headquarters at Bahia. In July she arrived at the Cape of Good Hope, in the neighbourhood of which she cruised for a couple of months, occasionally putting into Cape Town or Simon's Bay. Thence to the East Indies, the Malay Archipelago, and, after dodging the 'Wyoming' round Java, to China, returning to the Cape in March 1864, and sailing a few days afterwards for Europe. She arrived at Cherbourg on June 11; and on the 19th went outside to engage the 'Kearsarge' and be sent to the bottom. On the very face of this narrative, it is evident that though the 'Alabama' met with no enemy worthy of the name, she could not have kept the sea for more than three months without English assistance. Her coaling, her provisioning, her refitting, were all English; and we may perhaps agree with Professor Soley in thinking that had not the feeling in England inclined strongly in favour of the Confederates, the destruction of English property on board the prizes would have led the English navy to interfere, in a very summary manner, with her freedom of action. As it was, the aggrieved owners were coldly advised to claim compensation in a Confederate prize-court.*

* The Navy in the Civil War: The Blockade and the Cruisers. By J. R. Soley. P. 193.

So much for the 'Alabama' herself. The question remains, why did not the Northern navy put an end to her cruise? We are accustomed to think of the United States as a maritime power; but the fact is that when the civil war broke out, the States' navy had little beyond a paper existence; and though during the war the Northerners managed to get together a force numerically large and efficient for coast service, they had, throughout, very few ships of any value for purposes of ocean cruising. Some few they had; and of these the 'Vanderbilt,' one of the fastest and most powerful, was specially commissioned to hunt down the 'Alabama.' Her commander's orders, dated January 27, 1863, were to go to the West Indies, visiting any of the islands or any part of the Gulf at which it seemed likely the 'Alabama' might be found, or information obtained. He was then to go along the coast of Brazil as far as Rio; to cross over to the Cape of Good Hope, making everywhere careful enquiry, and, regardless of instructions, to follow the 'Alabama' wherever she should be heard of. There can be little doubt that had Captain Baldwin of the 'Vanderbilt' carried out his instructions, the 'Alabama's' cruise would have been shortened by some eighteen months. As it was, he had hardly got to the West Indies before he met Commodore Wilkes, who had already been sent into those waters on a similar errand, and whose idea of the best way to suppress the enemy's cruisers was to keep together under his broad pennant, not only the ships of his own command, but every other ship which came near him. He had thus already appropriated two ships, 'Oneida' and 'Cuyler,' detached by Farragut in pursuit of the 'Florida,' and he now in the same way, on February 28, 1863, appropriated the 'Vanderbilt.' He entirely set at nought her special orders; he transferred his flag to her, and he had the sublime impertinence to write to the Department of the Navy on March 20: 'I cannot well describe to you the efficiency of this steamer, and the excellent condition of discipline she is in, and the many advantages she offers for this particular cruising. Her speed is much beyond that of any other steamer I know of, and her armament is equal to anything she can possibly have to encounter.'* On June 13 Wilkes received peremptory orders to let the 'Vanderbilt' continue her cruise; but it was then too late. When Baldwin arrived on the coast of Brazil, he found, indeed, that the

* The Blockade and the Cruisers, p. 204.

'Alabama' had been there, but she had gone. He went to the Cape: there also he was too late; she had sailed, and no one could or would tell him whither she had gone. He therefore returned to America, without any opportunity of seeing or getting any exact news of the Southern cruiser. That Semmes was a man of remarkable ability was, of course, a distinct factor of the 'Alabama's' success; but notwithstanding this, it is difficult to conceive that, even if she got to sea at all, she could have lasted six months, but for the assistance she received from Englishmen and English ports, but for the miserable inefficiency of the States' navy, and but for the fatuous arrogance of Commodore Wilkes.

This, then, is the 'glorious model' which M. Charmes proposes to imitate. In carrying out his proposal he must not omit to provide the broadcast ports of a friendly neutral, and the neglect, the carelessness, the misunderstandings and the jealousies of an enemy's hastily improvised navy. From the example of the model it does not appear what the new 'Alabamas' are to do against a navy trained to exact discipline, obedience, and watchfulness by the traditions of centuries; against a swarm of enemy's cruisers in every sea, patrolling every ocean route, keeping guard over every port; without coal, without provisions, and often without a single harbour of refuge within many thousands of miles. That cruisers, even if not quite the ideal of M. Charmes, might do much mischief at the beginning of a war, is one of the evils which we must expect. No one supposes that war is to be waged without loss and suffering. But we hold the long-continued ravages which M. Charmes gloats over to be but the idle dream of ignorant ill-will.

Another phase of maritime war which M. Charmes contemplates is the destruction of undefended towns, for the mere sake of destruction. This is to be effected by gunboats of great speed and small draught of water, armed also with 14 c.m. guns. He says:—

'We propose to employ these only for the bombardment of open towns, commercial cities, points not fortified, off which they will appear suddenly and unexpectedly to perform the work of destruction, ready to fly at once if the defence should be too well provided for. It may, however, be necessary to blockade the naval ports, or even to seek to pass in, so as to immure or destroy the enemy's ironclads. By boldness and resolution the attempt may be successful. It is, indeed, impossible to enforce a blockade against fast cruisers or gunboats, but to prevent the egress of heavy ironclads by cruising off the port is a much easier operation. Some shot must, of course, be risked, but from the small size of the torpedo and gun boats the chances are that no damage

will be done. If, on the other hand, it is wished to force a passage in, this will be done by torpedo-boats of great speed, and withal so diminutive as to slip uninjured past the fire of the forts, whilst the gunboats apply themselves to silence these forts by lucky shots through the embrasures, or else spread dismay and confusion in the town by shelling the arsenal, the storehouses, and the private dwellings.'

Leaving on one side the morality and the manliness of such an attack on open towns, or of the wanton and unprovoked destruction of private dwelling-houses, and the certainty with which such outrages would recoil in terrible reprisals on the heads of the perpetrators, it is worth noting that this blockade of a port, this passing into a fortified harbour, even this bombardment of the coast, is only to be considered an easy matter when the assailants are French, and the harbours or coasts are prospectively English. Should the parts be reversed, no enemy's ship would be able to live near the coast; torpedoes, sea-mines, and shore batteries, would at once end her brief career. M. Charmes appears unable to realise that English harbours and English coasts might possibly be defended in the same way.

But amongst much that is wildly absurd some grains of gold may be found. M. Charmes dwells at considerable length on the grave defects of the present French system of coast defence, insisting in the most earnest manner that the whole should be entrusted to one service—in preference, to the navy. As it is, being divided between the navy and the army, the probability is that, in time of danger, misunderstanding and confusion would arise. His contention is that the three coasts of France, the north, the west, and the south, should be allotted to three vice-admirals, who should have entire command and control over all defensive forces and arrangements; that the mines, torpedoes, and torpedo-boats should be in the hands of sailors, and that the forts should be manned by seamen-gunners or marine artillerymen. 'To discharge the torpedoes, to support the 'torpedo-boats, to take advantage of their success, and to 'keep the enemy at a distance, sailors must be employed. 'Similarly, for the defence of the commercial ports, sailors 'will have to be drafted from the merchant ships. Both 'in men and armament the nautical element will necessarily preponderate and ought to be subject to naval 'authority.' It appears that in France, as in England, the arrangements for coast defence are principally entrusted to the army, the navy having a share in the defence of the naval ports, but only to a limited extent. It does not

seem strange that this should be the case in France, where the army is esteemed the superior service, and where, in joint operations, the admiral is subordinate to the general. But in England, where the navy is distinctly the senior service, where the Lord High Admiral or the Commissioners for executing the office have legal and almost absolute control over coast and shore, the meaning of placing the coast and harbour defence in the hands of soldiers and under the direction of a soldier officer, is one of those inscrutable mysteries with which our English authorities are in the habit of bewildering commonplace enquirers.

But unquestionably the most interesting subject of which M. Charmes has treated is the recent and very marked developement of the Whitehead torpedo, a weapon which was first brought into notice about the year 1870, and which, as well as the apparent scope of its action, was fully described in this Journal in 1874.* From the first it was admitted to be an engine of war which might occasionally and under favourable circumstances prove a useful auxiliary; but its uncertain, often eccentric, course, seemed to show that it was by no means impossible for it to attack a friend instead of an enemy, and its slow speed deprived it of any special tactical significance. It is only within the last few years that the difficulties have been fully removed, that the accuracy of its aim has been secured, that its speed has been increased, and that its extreme power has been unhesitatingly acknowledged. The torpedoes of the latest type have a speed of twenty-five knots, carry a charge of seventy pounds of gun-cotton, traverse a distance of 800 yards, and make good practice at 400. They are discharged into the sea through a tube which is virtually a species of light breech-loading gun, and is fitted on board a ship, above or below the water line, or in a boat. Any moderately large boat, such as a ship's pin-nace, may be used for this purpose; but the boats specially devised for it are themselves tactical instruments of quite recent developement. Those of the latest construction are about 110 feet long and of about 60 tons displacement, with noiseless engines and a speed of twenty-four knots. They have proved themselves admirable sea boats, perfectly well able to keep the sea, even in bad weather, though not, indeed, with too much comfort to those on board. Some have gone to Brazil; two were cruising last summer with the French Mediterranean fleet; and one, the 'Childers,' in the

early part of last year made the passage to Australia without any serious difficulty. But we are still a long way from finality; and even as we write, we are threatened with new types of torpedo, of longer range, carrying enormous charges, and capable of being steered from a distance.

It is no longer to be denied that torpedoes and torpedo-boats introduce a very important complication into the problems of naval warfare and naval tactics. So far as we can see, one immediate change is to restore to the gun a great part of the tactical value which during the last fifteen years it has been supposed to have yielded to the ram. With the extreme probability of being subjected to the fatal embrace of a torpedo, any ship would necessarily be very cautious about approaching another within 300 yards: or, on the other hand, if she can sink her enemy from that distance, she has no temptation to incur the risk of ramming. Again, the immediate answer to the torpedo-boat is the machine gun, which itself is each day becoming more murderous and more powerful. By day, the boat will have to advance against a ship under a hail of iron or lead; by night, it will have a beam of electric light thrown on it and be equally a target for the machine guns. The question is between the vigilance of the sentries, the efficiency of the electric light, and the aim of the machine guns, on the one side, and, on the other, the nimbleness of the attacking boats, their extreme speed, and the range and accuracy of the torpedoes. But the defence has yet other methods. Under circumstances of danger, torpedo-boats, or still more powerful boats of a similar character, which have been called torpedo-catchers, will be stationed at a distance as vedettes—if we may borrow a military name for a thing new to the naval service. These, armed with machine guns, may, it is supposed, prevent the attack, destroy or capture the boats that threaten it, or, at any rate, give timely warning of the enemy's approach. And, as a mere inert defence, the ships will be surrounded at the distance of a few feet by iron nets of sufficient strength, against which the torpedo will either hang or explode harmlessly. With proper care, it is maintained, the ship is thus effectually guarded, unless she has the peculiarly bad fortune to be attacked by two torpedoes, the second following exactly in the wake of the first.*

* The public and the naval profession are indebted to Hobart Pasha for an article of great interest on the efficiency of torpedoes in war,

The question is, however, to a great extent still in the experimental stage, and few, indeed, would care to pronounce any positive opinion. M. Charmes is one of these few. He is delightfully free from all sense of doubt or difficulty, and is prepared with an immediate solution to the problem. According to him, the torpedo-boat is the mistress of the situation. No enemy's ironclad or other large ship can remain afloat in its neighbourhood; its deadly attack can be neither resisted nor avoided. Nets he ignores; but torpedo-catchers, machine-guns, or electric lights are equally of no avail. The boats are too small and too fast to be easily hit, or even seen, if they approach under cover of mist or night. And they are not to attack alone. Two gunboats, four torpedo-catchers, and four torpedo-boats, ten in all, will form a group of attack which is to be counted as the equivalent of an ironclad. For the attack of a fleet there should be a group to each ship; thus if the fleet consists of twelve ships, there will be, of the different sorts, 120 boats. On sighting the enemy they will spread out, surround the fleet, and, under cover of night, destroy it; they will come in from every point of the compass, and their success is certain. It does not, indeed, appear why they may not themselves be destroyed by the flotilla of the fleet; nor yet in what way this enormous number of boats, without masts, signal flags, lights, or rockets, are to keep together in dark or stormy weather; how they are to manœuvre in concert; how the attack is to be made simultaneously. Every sailor is aware of the practical impossibility of keeping together a flotilla so constituted and so navigating; and every student of technical history knows that dependence

which appeared in the June number of 'Blackwood's Magazine.' This distinguished officer is the only person living (at least in Europe) who has commanded squadrons or single ships in war, where torpedoes were used as offensive weapons; and, in fact, in the last war between Russia and Turkey the Russians did use a very large number of torpedoes and torpedo-boats. They failed in every instance to destroy a Turkish ship, with the exception of two small wooden gunboats, which were blown up in the Danube. Hobart Pasha is of opinion that the value of the fish torpedo, as at present made, is greatly exaggerated; that the effective use of it is in the highest degree capricious and uncertain; and that it is not difficult to ward off its attacks, by a system which he himself adopted with good results. He points out that a torpedo-boat is too light and low a vessel to face a gale at sea, and that torpedoes cannot be fired with effect from any height above the surface of the water. Fixed torpedoes or mines for defensive purposes are, of course, a very different matter.

on concerted action over a wide area, afloat or ashore, leads to almost certain failure and disaster. M. Charmes is, however, happily free from all embarrassment on this score; he is neither sailor nor historian, and is serenely unconscious of the absurdity of his propositions.

But even without the full developement of his scheme, M. Charmes considers that electric lights and machine guns are quite powerless. He refers to a French experiment made last summer in the Mediterranean, when three torpedo-boats, sent away from the fleet, with orders to return as hypothetical enemies between midnight and 3 A.M., made their attack with perfect success, and were not seen till they showed position lights within forty yards of the flagship; and that, although the ships of the fleet were all on the alert and flashing their electric lights in all directions. Possibly the story is a little exaggerated; the electric lights were perhaps not quite so busy as is described; the officers of the watch or the sentries were perhaps ignorant of what was going on; and, in any case, no guard boats seem to have been sent away. The German North Sea fleet is said to have been successfully attacked in a similar manner by torpedo-boats from Wilhelmshafen; but in this instance, at least, no precautions whatever were taken, and the attack was of the nature of a surprise. Unquestionably, however, so far as they go, these experiments prove that the approach of skilfully conducted torpedo-boats requires to be as carefully guarded against. On the other hand, they do not prove that it cannot be guarded against, and from that point of view they must be considered in connexion with a more serious experiment made last summer off the mouth of the river Min.

On August 25, at 4 A.M., two Chinese boats, each carrying a spar torpedo, approached the French squadron, then lying at anchor in a position perfectly well understood. They steered at first for the ship nearest to them, the 'Vipère' gunboat, but being seen and fired at by the 'Vipère's' sentry, they changed their course and made for the much larger ship, the 'Duguay-Trouin.' Of the whole squadron, the 'Duguay-Trouin' and the 'Triomphante' ironclad only had electric lights, but they had no difficulty in at once illuminating the boats, when the 'Vipère' opened on them with her Hotchkiss revolver. The leading boat was immediately sunk; the crew of the second did not wait till she shared the same fate, but took to the water and so saved themselves.*

* *Revue Maritime*, t. lxxxiv. p. 526.

‘In face of the assertions of M. Charmes,’ says Captain Chabaud-Arnault, ‘this actual experience assumes an importance which it would not otherwise have; and though it would be too much to say that electric lights and Hotchkiss guns will always and as promptly quell an attack of torpedo-boats, we may none the less affirm that they will give very important assistance to the defence, and that the attack is by no means the absolute certainty which it has been described. The Chinese boats were, of course, slow and clumsily managed; fast Thornycrofts, in great number, would be very different; but, on the other hand, the defence was also very poorly provided. There were only two electric lights, no guard boats, no booms or nets; and the crews were worn out by the fatigues of forty-eight hours’ unrelenting exertion.’

Captain Chabaud-Arnault gives also a detailed account of what may be called the reverse of the medal, the destruction of two Chinese gun-vessels by French boats and spar torpedoes on August 23. Of the two ships attacked, one, the ‘Yang Woo,’ was struck full amidships, and, in a sinking state, was only just able to run herself ashore; the other, the ‘Foo Poo,’ was struck under the counter, and, though not destroyed, was for the time being quite disabled.

‘It was the first time in which torpedo-boats had acted openly in concert with ships, not attempting any surprise, differing in that respect from the destruction of some of the Turkish ships in the Danube by the Russians. Here it was broad daylight, and the enemy had full warning. All the circumstances of the attack were such as would be most unfavourable against an enemy skilful, watchful, well armed, well prepared, though in the present instance they entailed on us no ill consequence. Our boats, in fact, had the good fortune to be posted, before hostilities commenced, at 400 mètres from the enemy, and traversed this short distance before the Chinese could make up their minds to fire either gun or rifle at them. The ships, too, were stationary, had no machine guns of any kind and no external defence. The only thing which could at all tell against the attack was the strength of the current, running three or four knots, and even this was of great advantage to the boats in their retreat. It would be dangerous, indeed, to run away with the idea that such an attack could be carried out against the ships of any navy except the Chinese: under similar conditions spar-torpedo-boats would be riddled and destroyed long before they could get within striking distance, and with the ships lying end on, in a narrow river and a strong current, Whitehead torpedoes were inapplicable.’

It is curious that Captain Chabaud-Arnault does not consider approaching to a distance of 400 yards under cover of negotiations as of the nature of a surprise; though, as the Chinese were credulous or ignorant enough to permit such an approach, it is quite clear that they were taken by sur-

prise. But even so, writing with a full knowledge of the results, and in possession of the detailed reports of Admiral Courbet and the officers engaged, Captain Chabaud-Arnault forms the deliberate opinion that the new attack is by no means the irresistible, unavoidable thing which M. Charmes has fancied it; but that though extremely dangerous, though calling for, and indeed demanding, the most exact and unremitting care, preparation, and watchfulness, it may and ought to be opposed with success.

No doubt the introduction and developement of torpedoes opens out a new phase of naval war. Hitherto, surprises at sea have been of the most simple nature, capable of being guarded against by the most ordinary prevision, and have thus been, in effect at least, exceedingly rare. Henceforward they become more subtle, more exacting, partaking rather of the nature of ambuscades or nocturnal surprises on shore. But armies have not been done away with, war has not been rendered impossible because, once in a way, Diomed and Ulysses spread havoc and destruction through the Thracian camp; because Braddock's expedition was cut to pieces in the woods of Virginia; or because the 94th Regiment, marching through an enemy's country, as though from Aldershot to Portsmouth, was cruelly handled by the Boers at Bronkhurst Spruit. The necessity of sleepless and far-extending vigilance which has been taught and continues to be taught to soldiers by a thousand deadly experiences, is now brought home to sailors in a way from which they have hitherto been exempt; but to argue from the possibilities which untrained or unaccustomed carelessness has permitted, that attacks by surprise cannot be guarded against, is to falsify or ignore all the teachings of history, all experience of human nature.

But amidst the confusion and embarrassment which the new conditions give rise to, one thing is clear -- that the circumstances, and with them the conduct of naval war will be strangely modified. Captain Colomb has, indeed, argued that it is the duty of naval architects to be guided by the wishes and aspirations of naval tacticians, but that tactics are independent of the vagaries of naval construction.* In so speaking, we can only suppose that his words went further than his meaning; for no one knows better than he that in all ages tacticians have been dependent on the tools at their disposal; and just as they designed the line of

* Journal of the Royal United Service Institution, vol. xxix. p. 78.

battle when it was incumbent on them to develop the broad-side fire of their ships ; or as they returned to line abreast and group formations when steam power suggested ramming, and the diminished number of guns demanded a closer system of mutual support, so now we may be quite sure that the invention of the torpedo and the torpedo-boat will again compel them to new methods. In reality, no one branch of naval science is independent ; the plans and labours of the gunmaker, the engineer, the architect, and the sailor act and react on each other in a never-ending circle ; and whilst, on the one side, the torpedo has sprung into being contrary to the wishes of the tactician, we may be perfectly certain that his needs will give rise to some corresponding change in the construction of ships. What that change will be does not yet appear. Sir Edward Reed suggests a form of armour-plating for ships' bottoms, the efficiency of which is thought doubtful, and the idea has not yet been received with any favour. Sir George Elliot would prefer surrounding the ship, to the depth of fifteen feet below the water-line, with a permanent cage, or, as he calls it, a crinoline, which would not, he thinks, reduce the speed by more than one-sixth. This, however, may be doubted : we have no actual knowledge ; for the Admiralty have hitherto refused to encumber their ships with the very clumsy-looking appendage which Sir George Elliot has devised ; but, from the analogy of the nets now in use, it is commonly supposed that the reduction of speed would be extremely serious, and more nearly one-half than one-sixth. The effect would therefore be to make the ships less handy, and thus, in protecting them from the torpedo, to render them more obnoxious to the hostile ram. It is again, and perhaps on better grounds, believed by many that the real defence is to be found in a still further developement of cellular subdivision, of what M. Gougeard speaks of as the 'alvéolaire' or honeycomb system.

It is for the naval architect to solve the problem ; but whatever the solution, we may still be certain that in the future, as in the past, victory will be the prize of the best and bravest ; that—numbers and ships being fairly equal—that navy will have the best chances of success, whose officers are the most zealous, intelligent, and capable, whose men are the best and most carefully trained, whose native courage has been best cultivated by discipline and organisation. In this we see no cause of fear, though much for forethought and prevision. It is indeed a commonplace of the

shallow-minded to say that everything has been changed; that history offers no guidance, no lessons; that with the passing away of the old seamanship, our old advantage has gone; and that now, when yards have not to be crossed, topsails to be shifted, or the weather gage contested, the traditional English bluejacket has lost his value, and the English seaman, however good he may be, is no better than his neighbours. Before accepting such statements, it might be well clearly to understand the exact bearing of this traditional seamanship on our most important battles or most glorious victories, to ascertain when or how the crisis of an action turned on the struggle for the weather gage, or on any superiority of seamanship, as commonly misunderstood.

Now nothing in the naval history of the eighteenth century is more certain than that the possession of the weather gage was never found to have any tactical value, and that the French habitually ceded it to us whenever the struggle for it became at all close. This was notably the case off Cape Mola on May 20, 1756, and off Cape Henry on March 16, 1781. They preferred doing so to running any risk of having their line cut through; nor did they ever suffer any disadvantage in consequence; for, indeed, when they could not avoid action, the lee gage was, in many respects, better suited to the defensive tactics which it was their state policy to adopt. The fact, then, is that from the point of view of great battles, the particular phase of seamanship which has been so often referred to, had absolutely no importance: but what, on the other hand, had a very real and almost paramount importance, was that phase of seamanship which enabled the men of old to keep their ships at sea, often in spite of the most trying weather; to keep together, and to manœuvre in company and in close order, without endangering each other. One or two instances will best illustrate this position.

On the evening of August 17, 1759, the French fleet of twelve ships, under M. de la Clue, passed through the Straits of Gibraltar, and was, a few hours afterwards, followed by Boscawen with the English fleet of fourteen ships, more numerous and carrying more guns, but inferior in tonnage, in weight of broadside, and in number of men. An evenly contested action might therefore have been expected. Instead of that, the French, through carelessness, ignorance, or inexperience—in a word, through bad seamanship—divided their fleet during the night. Five ships parted company, and were not to be seen when morning broke: the other

seven were necessarily overpowered, and five of them were taken or destroyed by Boscawen's united squadron, which, under the same circumstances of weather, but with a more practised seamanship, had kept together.

The action off Dominica, on April 12, 1782, was brought about contrary to the wishes and manifest aims of the French admiral, solely by the lubberly and unseamanlike conduct of the 'Zélé,' which twice rendered it necessary for the French fleet to run to leeward in order to cover her, and which, by repeated collisions, disabled two ships to such an extent that they were unable to take their place in the line, and had to be sent to Guadeloupe before the battle. It was, again, the compact order of the English fleet, the straggling disorder of the Spanish, which gave the former the first decisive advantage off Cape St. Vincent on February 14, 1797; and it was through want of skill and experience that, in January 1805, when Villeneuve put to sea from Toulon, his fleet was dispersed and his ships shattered by the same gale which the English fleet endured without losing a spar.

It would be easy to multiply examples of the effect which superior seamanship has had on the course of a campaign: they were generally, but by no means invariably, in favour of the English, though during the long wars of the French Revolution and Empire the balance inclined absolutely to us. But the point to which we wish now to call attention, on which we insist, is this: that the seamanship which produced these good effects, and which gave us this undoubted advantage, was not the mere quickness and handiness aloft, but was the habitude of keeping the sea, that familiarity with the winds and the waves, that instinctive knowledge of the capabilities of ships, which is of as much value now as at any former time. Masts and yards are going, will perhaps soon be gone; but the winds and, above all, the waves remain; and the occasional incidence of blunders, such as entailed the loss of the English 'Vanguard' in 1875, or of the German 'Grosser Kurfurst' in 1878, is sufficient proof that there is still room for the display of seamanship, that it is still possible, for want of it, to be lubberly and dangerous.

This has, we fear, not been sufficiently realised. Like other people, naval officers are too apt to confuse the means with the end, and to consider that only worthy of the name of seamanship which relates to exercise aloft, or to the quasi-obsolete management of a ship under sail; whilst the everyday management of a ship under steam is supposed neither to call for nor to deserve any serious attention. The neces-

sary effect is, as Admiral Fremantle has well stated it, that 'in the royal navy at least, the officers who are really 'capable of perfect management of a ship under steam are 'less numerous than those who had made a name for themselves as brilliant seamen for their skill in handling a ship 'under sail in former days.' There are, indeed, valid reasons for this. In evolutions under sail, every officer on deck took part; saw, understood, in his own mind criticised what was going on, and discussed it afterwards. Under steam, the commanding officer gives an order, in a low voice, by a wave of the hand, or by a telegraph, to the helm or to the engine room, and the effect is produced, possibly enough, without anyone else knowing anything about it. The modern seamanship is thus not to be picked up as the old was; it has to be studied in sober earnest. And the necessity for this has not yet been fully understood. Young naval officers have not yet accustomed themselves to think and speak of seamanship as primarily the management of a ship. In the junior ranks they learn a great deal; but this, the first duty of a sailor, is too often slurred over or neglected.

'How many naval officers,' asks Admiral Fremantle, 'care to know the number of degrees of helm that can be given to their ships; the tending of the screw to turn the ship unassisted by the rudder; the effect of turning the engines astern when the ship has head or stern way; the result of increasing or reducing speed on the circle described in turning; what the nature of the so-called circle is; what the reduction of speed by putting the helm hard over; what heel a helm hard over may be expected to give the ship; what the drift angle means; what is the time of completing a circle at different speeds, and its diameter? These and other questions are simple points of seamanship; yet an officer who would think himself disgraced if he could not answer at once as to the lead of the lower studding-sail halyards or a flying-jib-guy, neither of which have been supplied to the ship in which he is serving, will acknowledge without a blush that he does not know if his screw is right- or left-handed, or how many blades it has.'

The result is that accuracy of manœuvring in critical situations is an art attained only by few. The screw is an instrument of marvellous power, but its niceties require to be carefully studied before they can be brought out. We have ourselves heard a very capable young captain in the navy say that he would feel more confidence in taking an old-fashioned ship out of Portsmouth Harbour under sail, than a new-fashioned one under steam. 'Under sail,' he said, 'I have the experience of centuries to guide me; under 'steam, I have but the experience of yesterday, and can

‘never feel quite sure that something may not turn up of which I know nothing.’ The whole question is one of extreme importance, and will, we hope, engage the attention of the Committee on the education of naval executive officers, which is now sitting; for notwithstanding the confident assertions of M. Charmes, of M. Gougeard, and others, we do not believe that the end of ships and fleets is a thing of the immediate future. Naval warfare may be, indeed will be, curiously modified, or, if the word is considered more suitable, reformed; but we know of nothing to convince us that it will be revolutionised to the extent implied; that fighting is to be abolished, that robbery and murder are to be substituted.

We have already referred to the legal aspect of some of M. Charmes’s bloodthirsty proposals. We may admit, indeed, that it is within the competence of any nation to sanction the bombardment of an undefended town, or the placing a torpedo under the bottom of an unarmed merchant ship; just as it is to recur at once to the old-established principle of consigning to the deep sea the crew of a captured ship, or of butchering in cold blood the inhabitants of a captured city. But it would be equally within the competence of other nations to pronounce those who reverted to these obsolete methods as ‘*hostes humani generis*,’ and to wipe them out of existence.

Again, there are certain rules for the conduct of war which have been accepted by the general agreement of civilised nations, the violation of which would subject the guilty parties to the penalties of piracy. One, perhaps the best established of these, is that which forbids a ship to fight under false colours, or without showing her flag. The rule, as hitherto formulated, has been that a ship may approach another under a friendly or neutral flag, but must haul it down and hoist her own before she fires a shot. If a country vessel converted into a torpedo-boat may do this, clearly very great caution will have to be used in permitting any vessel of uncertain identity to approach within a mile. It has been laid down that small fishing-boats in pursuit of their legitimate business are exempt from capture. In our last war with France the exemption was rescinded, because it was found that numbers of these craft were harmless fishing-boats in the presence of an English man of war, but were pirates, rather than privateers, when opportunity offered. This being once understood, the danger was quickly ended by sweeping the

fishermen, pirates or not, by thousands into the English prisons. And in the same way now, if it is understood that every harmless-looking fishing-boat may be a torpedo-boat in disguise, the result will certainly be extremely disagreeable to fishing-boats in general, whether harmless or not.

M. Charmes describes, with evident approval, an experiment of last summer in the Gulf of Finland. The fleet had divided into two parts, for the sake of waging a mimic war. The one division was in search of the other, and passed near some fishing-boats, the men in which appeared to be busily occupied with their nets and paying no attention to the squadron. Suddenly the admiral's ship was struck by a torpedo, and was, by the rules of the contest, declared to be disabled. The torpedo had been discharged from one of the fishing-boats, on board of which were two or three naval officers in the disguise of fishermen.* A similar story, or probably a more accurate version of the same, is given by the '*Russian Naval Magazine*:'—

'On the night of August 8 a party of volunteers from the Transund squadron got into Biörko-Sund, where the enemy's squadron was lying, in a hired Finnish coasting smack, and came alongside the cruiser "*Africa*," the flagship. One of the volunteers, midshipman Istomin, dressed as a Finnish peasant, boarded the cruiser and handed in a telegram. Whilst a receipt was being given for the telegram, the other volunteers on board the smack fastened a small buoy, with the inscription "*Frigate Prince Pejarsky*," under the stern of the "*Africa*." On getting clear of the side of the ship, midshipman Istomin fired off a rocket, which was intended to signify that the "*Africa*" had been blown up by one of our mines.†

Whether the fact referred to in these two stories is the same or not, is of little consequence. M. Charmes accepts it as a perfectly legitimate operation of war. That is not to be wondered at; but that the Russian authorities should have so accepted it is strange; for though the admiral was undoubtedly guilty of carelessness, and his ship was destroyed, the destroyers were equally guilty of piracy, and would, in real war, have been hanged. About this, we conceive, there is no doubt; for though the rigour of naval rules has happily been dormant for many years, on shore there has been no relaxation; and during the Franco-German war, peasants, or soldiers disguised as peasants, suspected of attempting hostilities, were at once shot. It is well, perhaps, to consider to what the toleration of such a stratagem might

* *Revue des Deux Mondes*, t. lxvi. p. 883.

† *Journal of the Royal United Service Institution*, vol. xxix. p. 241.

lead. There could be little or no difficulty in the way of any enemy obtaining possession of some small English vessel—yacht, fishing-boat, or smack—running openly in amongst the fleet at Spithead or elsewhere, and discharging a number of torpedoes. A yacht, for instance, flying a well-known burgee, and with the appearance of two or three ladies on board, would excite no suspicion. She could, of course, hardly hope to escape; but it is now implied that the crew might claim to be treated as prisoners of war. With the exception of recognised pirates, no cases of the kind are on record; there are no exact precedents, but we are much mistaken if the admiral in command would not immediately make one at the fore-yard-arm of the nearest square-rigged ship.

It is a marked and honourable distinction of the nineteenth century, since the peace of 1815, that efforts have been made to check and restrain the asperities and barbarities of warfare, and that hostilities are now carried on upon more humane and civilised principles than in former times, by limiting and defining the rights of belligerents, by protecting the rights of neutrals, and relieving, as far as possible, the civil classes of the population from the sufferings and oppression inseparable from war. Thus, instead of the seizure and embargo of traders on the outbreak of hostilities, an interval of time is allowed them to depart; the property of the enemy is respected, and commercial transactions allowed; irregular acts of hostility and imperfect blockades are condemned; and what may be termed the formalities of a state of warfare are more rigorously imposed. The Declaration of Paris in 1856 was a solemn recognition of these principles by all the great Powers of Europe, and we hold it to be of supreme importance to the best interests of this and every other nation, and of mankind at large, that they should be respected and observed. In the event of war between any of the great Powers, the interests and influence of neutrals will have an important bearing on the contest, and it is probable that they will be defended, not only by the minor States, but by the power and authority of the American Union.

It is therefore with great regret that we discover in some of the works now before us a tendency to deal very lightly with these engagements, and to advocate a relapse into practices of warfare which are only worthy of savages. M. Charney appears to regard the declaration which abolished privateering as of no binding obligation, and he views with

complacency every species of stratagem, disguise, surprise, and artifice by which the destruction, not only of an enemy's ships, but of undefended towns, and the lives and property of the inhabitants, could be effected. As we have already observed, war carried on by such means would give rise to the most severe reprisals, and in place of honourable and legitimate warfare the contest would degenerate into a struggle of brutality and ferocity. No nation would gain by such inhuman and dishonest methods of attack, and they would excite the indignant reprehension of the civilised world.

Too much weight must not be given to the crude opinions of an unauthorised journalist, but we have observed with surprise that in the recent contest between France and China, the Ministry of M. Ferry allowed its officers to depart on several occasions from the line of conduct we should have expected of them. War was carried on under the false name of 'reprisals,' and without any official declaration of hostilities, so that neutrals were unable to determine whether they had to meet a state of war or not. Blockades were established in an imperfect and irregular manner, and although in some instances neutral vessels were detained, none were ever brought within the jurisdiction of a court of prize competent to try the legality of the blockade. The entrance of the French squadron into the river Min in a pacific character but with hostile intentions, and the subsequent destruction of a Chinese arsenal thirty miles up the river, the batteries at the mouth being taken in reverse, was a highly questionable action. And the declaration that rice, the chief food of the population, was to be regarded as contraband of war, called forth a just and vigorous protest from the British Government; for not only was the attempt to cut off the supply of food from the non-combatant population an unwarrantable measure, but it had the effect of rendering all neutral vessels carrying rice to the towns on the coast of China liable to seizure and condemnation for illicit trading. The law of nations on this point is perfectly clear, and has always been recognised by the French themselves. Corn, rice, or other kinds of food are, like coal, articles which cannot be regarded as contraband of war, except in cases when their destination proves that they are intended to assist and supply the military or naval requirements and operations of the enemy. It is their *destination*, and not their own character, which may render them liable to capture, and when they are on their way to supply in the ordinary course of trade

the wants of the non-combatant population, the transport of such articles is perfectly legal, and can only be stopped by a strict and effectual blockade, which of course excludes everything.

We advert to these points because it is for the common interest of civilisation and mankind that war, and especially naval warfare, should be carried on with a strict regard to the rules which are sanctioned by the law of nations, and with as little interference as possible with the rights of neutrals and the property of non-combatants. It is by the collisions of fleets and armies, by the defence or capture of armed vessels and military positions, that such contests must ultimately be decided; and it is the interest, as well as the duty, of every civilised nation to abstain from operations which have no decisive effect on the result of the war, but can only aggravate its ravages and increase the number of its victims.

* * We have received a long letter from Sir Thomas Symonds, complaining of our personal reference to him in the article on 'The Past and Present State of the Navy,' in the last number of the 'Edinburgh Review,' disputing also our facts and controverting our arguments. So far as the personal reference is concerned, we are convinced that if he will again read the sentences in which his name is mentioned he will see that he has misinterpreted them, and thus found an offence which the language does not convey, and which was certainly not intended. The name and reputation of Sir Thomas Symonds are of themselves sufficient guarantee of the perfect honesty and truth of his convictions. As to the other points to which he takes exception, it is impossible for us to enter again into the details with which his letter is filled; but we utterly deny his position that 'the only safe comparison is the official,' understanding by that, 'the true official numbers . . . which, being extracts from official parliamentary returns, are impossible to refute.' On both sides, the mere official numbers, without explanation, are most misleading; the official numbers, with that explanation, as given by the Sea Lords of the Admiralty, are as we quoted them. We do not propose now to repeat our former statement, which a careful re-examination has only confirmed; but we may say that whilst we have full means of verifying and correcting our own returns, we have no means whatever of verifying those of foreign Powers. Sir Thomas Symonds knows that the ships on our own list are not all effective; but, without knowing, he assumes that every ship on the French list is so. We have good reason for believing that this assumption is incorrect; and we know that French publicists complain of the inefficient and unduly weak state of the French navy, in terms as bitter as even Sir Thomas Symonds can employ to describe the state of the English navy.

- ART. X.—1. *Corea (the Hermit Nation)*. By WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS. 8vo. London: 1882.
2. *History of Corea (Ancient and Modern)*. By Rev. JOHN ROSS. 8vo. Paisley: 1880.
3. *Parliamentary Papers: Corea*. Nos. 1 and 2. 1885.

THE security of navigation and trade in the North Pacific depends upon the action of more than one country, but to a very important extent upon the state of Corea. It has fortunately become a matter of recognised importance with all the principal nations trading in Eastern seas, and much has been done towards placing the question on a safe and simple basis since the article on Corea which appeared in this Journal thirteen years ago. Even in the much shorter interval of five years which has elapsed since the question of naval power in the Pacific* was elaborately treated in our pages, the whole subject has undergone so many important changes as to render a further consideration of the problem under its new conditions highly useful and desirable. For within that period our knowledge of Corea, which was before mainly derived from the Roman Catholic missionaries, has made great progress, and we have now more than one work on the country and several highly interesting consular reports describing parts of Corea into which no foreigner had previously penetrated. In the first place it must be stated that the sole cause of our being in this more favourable position is the treaty which opened 'the forbidden land' to our consuls and our traders, and the ratification of which was one of the last acts of Sir Harry Parkes, in whom his country lost a public servant who contributed for forty years in a prominent degree to maintain the name and interests of England in the far East, and whose eminent services in China and Japan cannot be forgotten or easily replaced even by the appointment of Sir Robert Hart.

In 1872 the prospects of foreign intercourse with Corea were gloomy in the extreme. Two naval expeditions, the first French and the second American, had failed to achieve any practical result, or to shake the determination of the Corean Court and people to have nothing to do with the nations of the West. As the Regent Tai Wang Kun wrote

* The earlier of these two articles, that on 'Corea,' appeared in No. cclxxviii., October, 1872. The later one, on 'Naval Power in the Pacific,' was published in No. cccxi., July, 1880.

to the representative of the United States, 'Do you want our land? That cannot be. Do you want intercourse with us? That cannot be either.' Mr. Griffis shows still more clearly how high the confidence of the Coreans in their capacity to defend themselves was raised by the retreat of his countrymen, and in confirmation of his statement he narrates a story that 'when a Scotch missionary in Shing-king reasoned with a Corean concerning the power of foreigners and their superiority in war, the listener's reply, delivered with angry toss of the head and a snap of the fingers, was, "What care we for your foreign inventions? "Even our boys laugh at all your weapons."' It was at this unpromising stage of the Corean question that we concluded our remarks in 1872, and we have now to describe the events which have happened in the interim and which have given a favourable turn to the solution of the problem.

The efforts of two of the principal naval and commercial Powers in the far East had produced no perceptible result. It remained for the two Asiatic countries which had had the longest connexion with the peninsula to solve the difficulty. In Corea China and Japan had rival pretensions, and on more than one occasion their armies had met in hostile collision within a state which each claimed as being bound to it in the ties of vassalage. The unsettled condition of the borders on the Yaloo river, added to the reported excellence of Corean pasturage and ginseng, urged the Chinese Government to adopt active measures at the very same moment that the Japanese came to the determination to give practical effect to their claims in the capital and ports of Corea. Although the Chinese firmly established their authority on the Yaloo, and absorbed the whole of the debateable territory up to that stream, the Japanese were still more energetic in their proceedings, and endeavoured to carry with a high hand pretensions which dated from a more remote period. The immediate cause of offence to the Tokio authorities was of a similar character to the grievance which had provoked the intervention of France and the United States. It was in September, 1875, that the Coreans fired upon the crew of a Japanese man-of-war, and the commander of the latter retaliated by landing a force which captured and destroyed a fort. On learning of this affair the Mikado's Government sent an envoy to Peking to ascertain what were the Chinese views as to the dependency of Corea, and at the same time fitted out an expedition to Seoul for the purpose of demanding from the Corean Government

a treaty making commercial concessions. The Chinese, threatened by a rupture with England on account of the then unsettled Yunnan outrage, were not disposed to add to their liabilities by accepting the unlimited responsibility of making reparation for the outrages that the Coreans might commit on their coasts, and Mr. Griffis says that the Japanese envoy received at Peking 'the written disclaimer of China's 'responsibility over "the outpost state."' It is doubtful whether this 'written disclaimer' partook of the character of a formal diplomatic document. Meantime the naval expedition had fared equally well. The commissioners of the two states met on Kangwha island, and after protracted and tedious discussions they agreed to a treaty which in the first place declared Corea to be an independent country, and in the second granted the Japanese special privileges in matters of trade. The terms of the treaty were ratified in the most formal manner by the despatch of a Korean embassy to Japan.

The chief place of trade for the Japanese is Fusan, where during the last nine years a very considerable amount of business has been done. But in 1880 a second port was opened to the Japanese at Gensan, which it is hoped will prove to the eastern coast of Corea what Fusan has been to the southern. The prospects of trade were deemed to be far superior here to what they were at Fusan on account of the natural wealth of the neighbourhood in furs and minerals, and the greater material welfare of the inhabitants. The harbour of Gensan is termed magnificent, but the Japanese have not succeeded in obtaining more than five per cent. of the commerce of a place which they were chiefly instrumental in opening to the merchandise of the world. In 1880, after the old objections had been revived and again vanquished, a third port, Inchun, situated only twenty-five miles from Seoul, the capital of Corea, was opened to the Japanese, who at once proceeded to mark off the ground for their concession. Inchun did not prove a very eligible position as a port of trade, for large vessels could not anchor within a mile of the shore, and the rise and fall of the tide sometimes differed to the extent of 29 feet. In winter, moreover, the sea is frozen for some distance from the land. Although unsuited to be the centre of any extensive trade, the mere declaration that a place so close to the capital as Inchun was to be rendered accessible to strange visitors and men of commerce served to intensify the feeling of animosity prevailing among a large section of the king's ministers and courtiers. The king's father, Tai

Wang Kun, who had for many years held supreme power as regent, and who regretted in his retirement the loss of the authority he had possessed so long, put himself forward as the leader of the anti-foreign party, and all the old traditions found in him a zealous supporter. Whether he adopted this attitude from settled conviction, or in the hope of realising his personal ambition, must always remain a matter of opinion; but there is no doubt that the much-debated question of opening a port to external trade so near the capital as Inchiun brought Tai Wang Kun back into that prominence which he had lost on resigning the regency.

Unfortunately for him the tide which bore Tai Wang Kun, who was described by a native writer as having 'a heart of stone and bowels of iron,' towards the recovery of power had come too late. Those Coreans who wished to maintain the seclusion of their country based their arguments and aspirations on a Chinese model, and assumed that the Pekin Government would approve and support those who resolutely endeavoured to preserve their exclusiveness as dependants of the Middle Kingdom. Tai Wang Kun and his followers were destined to a rude disappointment in these hopes; for while in 1876 the Pekin Government had repudiated all responsibility for Corean action, Li Hung Chang in 1880 wrote a letter strongly advising the Coreans to conclude treaties with all the great commercial nations, for their best chance, he said, of continued security and independence lay in the direction of enlisting the interest of as much of the outside world as possible in the condition of their country. When the Chinese authorities recommended the opening of the kingdom and the abandonment of the old policy of concealment, the most exclusive of the ministers at Seoul began to entertain doubts as to the wisdom of Tai Wang Kun's recommendations, at the same time that the conclusion became irresistible that it was useless to oppose the Japanese if the Chinese signified their approval of what they were doing. The young king had attached himself at an early period of his reign to the party of progress, and subsequent events had not merely vindicated his judgement, but had brought many of the leading men round to his way of thinking. When Tai Wang Kun was ready to make a fresh bid for power, the conditions had altered so materially that there was no longer any great probability of a fanatical leader succeeding in uniting the opinion and forces of the country in a league for the rigorous exclusion of all foreigners. The plot of

Tai Wung Kun was rather the despairing effort of personal ambition than the manifestation of public unanimity on the question of Corea's external relations.

The signature of the treaties with the other nations besides the Japanese—an event which marked the year 1882 as a memorable one in Corean annals—served to intensify the ex-regent's malignity and to hasten the catastrophe. The American treaty was signed first, on May 9; one with China was concluded almost at the same time. Sir Harry Parkes, then Minister at Tokio, was only a few days behind the rest, and early in June a treaty was drawn up and signed between England and Corea. France and Germany followed next, and entered into treaty relations with what had been until a few days before the most rigorously secluded state in the world. The signature of these treaties, in which China and Japan had taken the chief initiative, was followed not by symptoms of popular dissatisfaction with the new policy marked out for the state by the young king, but by abundant evidence testifying to the fact that the Coreans were free from many of the prejudices attributed to them, and that they were fully alive to the advantages of trade. The Japanese mission resident at Seoul became the focus of the civilising influences at work in the country; and although Li Hung Chang had the greater share in the execution of this policy, the leaders of the party opposed to change concentrated their efforts and antipathies in a single project to expel the Japanese. This was the more natural, inasmuch as the treaties with the European states, although signed, awaited ratification before coming into operation, and the Japanese mission in Seoul alone represented in a practical form the changes which were imminent. The Chinese, not having adopted either the dress or the habits of the West in any visible degree, were not marked out in the same way for Tai Wang Kun's resentment. Moreover they were in considerable force, and residing in their camp outside the city. Mr. Griffis gives a long account of Tai Wang Kun's plot, and we cannot do better than quote the principal passages from his narrative.

‘The light-hearted Japanese seemed to suspect no imminent danger, although the old fanatic and tyrant Tai Wang Kun was still alive and plotting. To ensure perfect secrecy for his plans, it is said that he employed two or three mutes to wait on him and act as his messengers. He was the centre of all the elements hostile to innovation, and, being a man of unusual ability, was possessed of immense influence. The populace of Seoul and of the country had been taught to believe that

"the Japanese were inebriated with the manners of Christian nations "and were enchanted by the Western devils." Every means had been used to inflame the people against foreigners. Stone monuments had been set up on the high roads and market-places, which bore this inscription: "The Western barbarians will come to invade our soil. "There are but two alternatives for Chosen: to go to war or to maintain peace. To submit peacefully means to sell the country; therefore we Coreans must resort to arms."

Tai Wang Kun eagerly seized the opportunity for which he had long been waiting; and, as it happened, a number of extraneous circumstances occurred to confirm the superstitious among his friends and supporters in their attachment to his views.

'Just when the populace was most excited over the near presence of the Americans and other foreigners at Inchium, the usual rainfall was withheld, the wells dried up, and in the consequent drought the rice crop was threatened with total failure. The diviners, sorcerers, and anti-foreign party took advantage of the situation to play on the fears of the superstitious people. At the same time the soldiery of the capital were disaffected, as some say on account of arrears of wages, or, as others aver, because the old warriors of the bow and arrow hated the Japanese method of drilling as a foreign innovation insulting to the gods. A more probable reason is that on account of the failure of the rice harvest the soldiers' rations were cut down, and they were deprived of this choice cereal for food. Among the first Corean officers killed was the superintendent of the rice storehouses, which were pillaged by the hungry mob.'

The actual rebellion or riot took place on July 23, 1882, while the king was engaged praying in the open air for the rain so greatly needed. An attempt was made by some of the ex-regent's followers to seize his person, but the king fortunately succeeded in reaching the castle before his pursuers. In this extremity the idea seems to have occurred to Tai Wang Kun or one of his supporters to throw the blame on the Japanese, and a report was diligently spread to the effect that the latter had assaulted the king, and were actually besieging him in the royal castle. In the excited state of the public mind the report found ready credence. Men did not stop to enquire how forty Japanese were to overcome the resistance of the royal army and the population of a large city. The rioters, numbering four thousand men, who showed themselves extremely skilful in hurling stones, attacked and destroyed the residences of the ministers who favoured the foreigners, and for a long time it was believed that the queen was killed during the early part of the riot, but Queen Min fortunately escaped. She remained

in concealment, however, until affairs had regained their normal quiet, and the statement of her safety came as a surprise long after these events had passed into history. Then the mob turned upon the Japanese, and hastened to lay siege to the house where the envoy Hanabusa and his suite were living. Mr. Griffis gives the following account of the fight which ensued:—

‘Hanabusa and his suite then arranged a plan of defence. While thus engaged, a Corean employed at the Legation informed them that the mob had destroyed the houses of the ministers, and were attacking three Japanese students. Three policemen, well armed, then left to succour the students, but nothing was heard from either policemen or students again. A Corean officer now appeared and warned the Japanese to escape, and being requested by Hanabusa to ask the Government for soldiers he left on this errand. At 5.50 the mob reached the Legation and, raising a yell, fired volleys of bullets, arrows, and big stones at the house, but dared not enter the gate to face the revolvers of the policemen. . . . The Japanese fired the remaining buildings, and, armed only with swords and pistols, formed themselves into a circle, charged the mob, and cut their way through to the house of the chief magistrate, which they found empty. They marched to the southern gate of the royal castle. Instead of opening it the soldiers on the wall above pelted them with stones.’

After this the Japanese made their way across the river, and succeeded in reaching Inchun in safety, thanks in no small degree to the intervention of a terrific thunderstorm. The governor received them in a friendly manner, and provided them with shelter, but during the night the Coreans attacked them again, and the survivors fled to Chemulpo, whence they crossed over to Roze island. They were subsequently taken on board the English surveying ship ‘Flying Fish.’ These events, which threatened to put an end to the hopes of a favourable settlement of the Corean question, hastened, as the result proved, the realisation of the projects to which the treaties had given rise. The Japanese Government were bound to resent in the most determined manner so flagrant an outrage as this attack on their envoy, and preparations were made for war. Hanabusa was sent back to Seoul with a strong military escort, and the Coreans were given to understand that not merely would the strict letter of the treaty be enforced, but that the fullest reparation would be required for the massacre of the Mikado’s subjects and the insult to his flag. Hanabusa was received with marks of honour, and at an interview with the king he presented the demands of his Government. The Corean authorities did not refuse compliance with them. They merely

resorted to the usual Oriental device of delay. Hanabusa's instructions were of a peremptory character. Five days after his arrival he left Seoul, not having received the king's reply to his propositions. War seemed inevitable.

During this crisis the Chinese had not remained inactive. They had a considerable force in a camp outside Seoul. Li Hung Chang at once ordered four thousand men to reinforce it, and at the same time sent a fleet of warships to the mouth of the Han river. It was considered doubtful whether these vigorous measures foreboded the support of the anti-foreign party, or the active assertion of China's own rights in Corea should that state become the scene of hostilities. No one supposed or suggested that Li Hung Chang's policy aimed at precipitating the result which he had indicated seven years before. Yet such was the case. The Chinese troops did not come in order to encourage an attitude of isolation, or to absorb territory in the name of the Peking emperor, but to impress upon the Korean Government the absolute necessity of making every reparation to the Japanese, and of religiously carrying out the provisions of the various treaties. The Chinese did more than advise. They took the most vigorous and effectual action in their power by arresting Tai Wang Kun and sending him to Tientsin. An attempt had been made to screen that personage. The riot was attributed to the unpaid soldiery, and credit was given to the ex-regent for having granted honourable burial to the victims of these popular excesses, and for having at the same time made up his mind to adopt henceforth a more liberal and enlightened policy. But, whatever weight these representations might have carried with the Japanese, the Chinese were quite resolved to have a definite settlement of the difficulty. So long as Tai Wang Kun remained at large there could be no feeling of security, but by removing him the Chinese felt that they were taking away the chief element of disturbance. Their view was shown to be correct, for after the disappearance of the ex-regent there was no further trouble, and Korean hostility to foreigners seemed to be permanently allayed.

The vigorous action of the Chinese paved the way for a satisfactory settlement of the difficulty with Japan. Hanabusa returned to Seoul, and the Korean Government gave assurances that the terms of his sovereign would be complied with; but no promise was so satisfactory as the generally prevailing conviction that Peking had resolved that there should be peace. In a very short time the terms of a convention were drawn up, and the Koreans agreed to appease

Japanese pride by arresting the principal insurgents, and punishing them in the presence of Japanese delegates. A sum of money was also assigned as compensation for the families of the murdered men. A large indemnity was also promised the Japanese in consideration of the insult to their flag and of the expense to which they had been put, while a special embassy was to bear to Tokio the amplest letters of apology. There were besides explicit stipulations with regard to the future. The Japanese were to be allowed to station a considerable body of troops at Seoul for the protection of their minister, and increased facilities were to be granted for trade and travelling in the interior of the country. These concessions seemed likely to give a preponderating influence to the Japanese in the councils of Seoul, but the Chinese maintained their position by ordering the considerable force sent on the first outbreak of disturbances to establish a permanent camp and remain at the scene of action. At the same time they assumed the charge of the Corean customs, and Herr Ohlendorff and other members of Sir Robert Hart's service proceeded to the ports just opened for trade in order to organise a customs establishment.

It was immediately after these events that by the working of the treaties foreign merchants and even consuls began to make a more frequent appearance in Corea. Inchun was definitely abandoned in favour of Chemulpo, but from the description given by Mr. Consul-General Aston in his interesting report it would seem as if it left much to be desired in respect of convenience and accessibility. He says:—

‘Chemulpo is about sixty miles distant from the capital by river and about twenty-six by land. The anchorage is safe and commodious, but it has some serious disadvantages. The approach to it is far from easy, involving the navigation of a confined estuary for a distance of sixty miles, and the tides run about three knots an hour at springs, seriously interfering with the landing and shipping of cargo. The anchorage is nearly two miles from the settlement, but there is fortunately a smaller branch of the river accessible at high tide, where there is room for four or five small steam-vessels drawing, say, not more than thirteen feet. Even vessels of this class must be moored stem and stern, or they touch the ground instantly when swinging at low tide. This creek is nevertheless most useful, and nearly all cargo is shipped or discharged here.’

Nearly the whole of the trade of Chemulpo is in the hands of the Japanese, but the articles which they import are almost exclusively of European manufacture. The principal English firm in China have had an agent established

there during the last two years; and now that the Russian Government have thought it worth their while to place a consul at Chemulpo, it seems probable that Mr. Aston's future reports will show Europeans to have a larger, and their Japanese rivals a proportionately smaller, share in its trade. Two other ports, Pusan or Fusan and Wönsan, have also been opened to foreign commerce, and there also the Japanese have succeeded to a great extent in anticipating other nations. The trade, however, is extremely small, and although progressing it is at such a slow rate as to make it a matter of some time before it can reach large dimensions. Another great obstacle which will have to be overcome is the question of the coinage. The old coin of Corea was a brass or copper cash, and it was reckoned that four hundred of these coins were equivalent to one Mexican dollar, but owing to depreciation the current rate of exchange had latterly become 525 cash to one dollar. The Corean Government attempted to solve the difficulty by issuing a new coin called tango, which was said to be equal to five cash. The coinage of tangoes became one of the most profitable pursuits in the country, and the most rigorous measures adopted against offenders failed to check the profitable pursuit of coining. The weight of this money is another serious objection and hindrance to trade, for Mr. Aston tells us that 'fifty dollars' worth is as much as a coolie can carry, and it 'is practically impossible to prevent loss by pilfering.' In describing a tour into the interior of the country, Mr. Aston mentions several facts showing the difficulties with which foreign commerce will have to contend. Among these are the few wants and simple habits of a people who do not possess or care for any furniture in their houses, and among whom a merchant with a capital of ten dollars is a prosperous individual. The people show no rudeness to foreigners, and indeed seem to feel little curiosity about them. The Coreans are far more apathetic than either of their neighbours in China and Japan.

Mr. Carles, who travelled through parts of the country where no European had preceded him, confirms the general impressions which a perusal of Mr. Aston's report leaves upon the mind. The interior of the country is stated to be extremely difficult of access, and the routes connecting one part with another are in many places impassable. There is communication, however, between Seoul and the port of Gensan on the east coast, where the Japanese have established one of the most flourishing centres of trade in the

kingdom. By this route the central chain is crossed at no greater height than 2,000 feet. But Mr. Carles's testimony is still more important as regards the present poverty or backwardness of the state than on the subject of its deficient means of communication. Phyong-yang has been justly praised for its prosperity and picturesqueness, yet this is what Mr. Carles is compelled to write about it:—

‘It is in towns such as Phyong-yang that the poverty of the country is fully realised. In the villages and mountains little sign of wealth is expected, and the clean outer clothing of the men and the good quality of their food foster an expectation in the traveller of finding thriving towns bearing some evidence of comfort. The towns, however, are simply large villages with streets of mud cottages grouped around official residences, which, from the gateways leading to them and the numerous courtyards surrounded by substantial buildings well raised above the ground, have by contrast with their surroundings an air of almost palatial grandeur. The interior of the yamens is, however, almost as bare as that of the cottages. The furniture of a room consists in a folding screen placed against the blank wall and mats on the floor; and it is only in the quality of the mats, the condition of the paper on the wall, the absence or presence of a screen, or the style of painting on its panels, that the grades of riches and poverty are detected. Even the appointments of the table differ but slightly. Each villager has a separate table with a separate set of brass bowls, containing his portion of rice, soup, soy, in the same manner that the governor of a province is served.’

At Phyong-yang, however, there are signs of improvement, for it has been thought prudent by the principal men of the place to found a trading company with a capital of nearly 150,000 dollars, and this company has an agency at Chemulpo. There can be no doubt that native associations like this will contribute as much to the commercial development of the Corea as the most strenuous efforts on the part of foreign merchants. The obstacles to the energetic and successful prosecution of trade which exist on the sea-coast through the dangers of navigation and the comparative rareness of safe harbours do not present themselves on the land side, and as the natural consequence there is considerable traffic across the Yaloo river, which now forms the boundary between China and Corea. But the inferiority of the Coreans as cultivators of the soil is brought into prominent relief by the superior prosperity of the Chinese settlers on the right bank to what exists among the Corean on the left. The Yaloo river ought to prove one of the chief means of developing the northern part of Corea, for it could be used for a great portion of its course by tug-boats, except

during the floods, which are particularly high and disastrous at certain seasons. There is much doubt as to how far down its course this river is navigable, and the entrance is stated to be barred by sand flats ten miles in extent. Mr. Carles was unable to decide the point, for 'the difficulty of approaching the river's mouth from the land appears to be very great, and the absence of Corean passenger boats prevented my settling a question on which I could obtain no light from official sources.'

The backwardness of the Coreans in the arts and knowledge which tend to make a community rich and prosperous is shown in all their habits and in their general life. The men wear basket-shaped hats of great size and weight, which absolutely incapacitate them for the performance of any labour; and their usual occupation is to walk about with their hands up the loose sleeves which they always wear. The women have neither of these privileges (they wear lighter basket-shaped hats, and close-fitting sleeves), and consequently they do most of the field labour and all the housework. Mr. Carles makes some very instructive comments on the defects of Corean administration, which deserve careful consideration.

'Chief among these defects is undoubtedly the enormous staff of underlings attached to the local yamens. To take the province of Phyong-an as an instance: there are in it forty-four districts, each under the supervision of a magistrate whose staff on an average consists of 400 men, whose only public duties are the policing of the district and the collection of taxes, but the chief part of the latter duty is taken off their shoulders by the heads of tithings. There are thus in the cities of Phyong-an province 17,600 men, whose board alone at the rate of two dollars per month amounts to 392,400 dollars. Many of them, however, receive more than their bare food, and all are well clad and lodged. It is not only in the expense entailed by the maintenance of such an army that the country suffers, though probably three-fourths of the expense could be curtailed without any diminution in the efficiency of the public service, but the nation suffers as well through the labour which is lost to it. If 12,000 men, most of them able-bodied, were turned into artisans and labourers, the material condition of Phyong-an would be very different from what it now is. Another great obstacle to the progress of the country lies in the sumptuary laws and the insecurity of property. What stimulus has a labouring man to work when the utmost that he can do with the fruits of his toil is to procure some more copper pots and lay in a larger store of spirits? He is not allowed to exercise his wits by making himself chairs and furniture. Chairs are for the use of magistrates, and not for working men. If he has an excess of funds, he may subscribe with his neighbours towards the repainting of the

towers on the city gates, and either erect or restore an official tablet, or, if he is still at a loss as to how to dispose of his money, lend it to the magistrate, to whom he may at the same time present some of his surplus stock of pigs or calves. It is undoubtedly the knowledge that the acquisition of riches will only slightly benefit their holder that induces such extraordinary apathy as is seen in Corea, and no change for the better can be hoped for until men know that their property is their own to deal with.'

With regard to what might in the future be expected under favourable conditions in Corea, we may make a final quotation from the report of Mr. Carles.

'It is evident that the country is easily susceptible of great improvements. At present on the eastern road a few hundred yards of bad ground here and there prevent carts being used continuously along its whole length. Again, the country is being impoverished year by year through want of protection for its woods, which form one of the chief treasures of the land. Were a little care exercised in this direction, and were sheep and goats gradually introduced on to the downs and hills which now serve only to supply firewood, a great improvement might be seen without much expense being incurred, such as later on will be requisite on replacing the present coinage by a currency in one of the precious metals. The innate spirit of gambling in a Corean is so great that it is doubtful whether the natives as a whole would be benefited by the removal of the present restrictions on the working of gold and silver. The result of the change probably would be that men would leave their farms to rush to the gold mines, the outturn of which, though sufficient to repay the work of spare hours and to form a very useful supplement to a man's income if he lived on the spot, would in all probability demonstrate that the fabled wealth of Corea vanished like a fairy's gift on being roughly handled.'

The position of Corea is such that both China and Japan are bound to vigilantly watch each other's movements in that quarter, and to provide against unforeseen contingencies, for a Japanese invasion of the peninsula would not be more dangerous to Peking than a Chinese occupation and colonisation of Corea would prove menacing to the independence of Japan. If left to themselves, the Chinese and Japanese would be a fair match for each other in this quarter, and all their efforts would not avail to produce any important change in the relative position of the state which the Chinese call their 'right arm of defence.' But others besides these two Asiatic peoples are not merely anxious to take a part in moulding the future shape of Corea, but are actually in as favourable a position as the two historical rivals in 'the land of morning calm' to assert their preten-

sions and realise their ambitions. The question of supremacy does not lie as of old solely between the rulers of Peking and Tokio. Russia has on land a not less commanding post of vantage with regard to Corea in her possessions in maritime Manchuria than China in the province of Shingking, while on sea her Pacific squadron may be assumed to be more than a match for the whole fleet of Japan. She is a third claimant, with equal material advantages if fewer theoretical rights, to participate in the settlement of Corcan affairs. But for the wise stroke of policy identified with the name of Li Hung Chang, which made all the treaty Powers equally interested in the unfettered developement of this country, we cannot doubt that Russia would ere this have taken some more decided step than has yet been done to secure a direct control over that portion of the peninsula which seems most accessible to her and best suited for her purposes. The recent appointments of a consul-general at Seoul and a consul at Chemulpo show that she is not disposed to forego the privileges conceded by treaty, although the chances of there being any Russian trade with this part of Corea appear remote.

The advantages of the new policy, which seems to have been at last unreservedly adopted by the Corcan Court, are not limited to its having been the means of adjusting the differences between China and Japan. The principal benefit accruing from the signature of the treaties is that they have imposed some fetters and limitations on the further progress of Russia towards the Yellow Sea. Until they were concluded there was no special reason why Russia should not cross the Tunen and appropriate any places on the north-eastern coast of Corea which she might covet. It was a matter in which she possessed much latitude of discretion, and in which, indeed, she was only dependent upon her own sense of what was wise or prudent. But now she cannot act in this manner without violating what is deemed to be for the common good; and although the barrier is only of a moral kind, yet it may not prove altogether ineffectual. The position of Russia in the North Pacific is so powerful that no other force will avail to restrict its developement at the expense of the Asiatic countries and peoples immediately dependent upon their own resources than the expression of what is deemed to be to the benefit of the commercial community in the far East, supported by the naval power of England in the last resort.

Thirty years ago the position of Russia in the North

Pacific was feeble in comparison with what it is to-day. The English expeditions against Nicholaievsk and Petropaulovski during the Crimean war achieved no striking success, not because the Russian forts were strong and their garrisons valiant, but simply on account of the difficulties of navigation and the density of the fogs in the narrow channel between Saghalien and the mouth of the Amour. Five years after the conclusion of peace Russia made an important step in advance by absorbing that part of Manchuria which lies along the sea-coast, and the remembrance of the success with which she had foiled the attempts of the English navy in 1855-6 encouraged her to take up a new position nearer to the principal centres of trade in China and Japan. In 1861 the Peking Government, occupied by its own troubles with England and France, was easily induced by General Ignatieff, who then represented the Czar at the Chinese capital, to sign a treaty ratifying the Russian occupation of Maritime Manchuria. But the new possession has proved scarcely more valuable than the old. Nothing has been done towards developing the natural resources of the province, and the interior, except for the route selected for a line of telegraph, remains inaccessible and unknown. The contrast between the progress effected on the Chinese side of the frontier in the valleys of the Songari and Usuri, and the stagnation in which the districts under Russian rule have remained, is striking and not very creditable to the latter. The attention of the Russian authorities has been devoted to the search for a convenient harbour along the coast, and having found it at last in Vladivostock, they could bestow no thought on the general welfare of the province, but strove solely to make this place the strongest fortress and harbour on the Pacific.

The position of Vladivostock, a name signifying in Russian 'Dominion in the East,' is, in many respects, admirable. Situated on a small peninsula or spit of land, it commands, together with the forts on the isles forming the Eugénie group, both sides of Victoria Bay; and there is no question that if Hongkong were as well defended as this Russian station is, there would not have been the complaints of our neglecting our colonial defences which have of late been freely expressed. The anchorage is safe and sheltered, and it is said that thirty large men-of-war can easily ride in either Guérin or Napoleon Gulf. The natural advantages of Vladivostock being far from inconsiderable, and the Russian authorities having expended large sums of money on its

improvement, it might be thought that Russia would be satisfied with what she had obtained. But Vladivostock has one serious disadvantage. The anchorage is closed during the winter months by the ice, and consequently Russia is deprived of the assistance of her volunteer fleet and Pacific squadron at the very season which is most favourable to warlike operations in every other part of her dominions. For this reason the Russians have been engaged for some years in selecting the site of a new naval station, which, while possessing all the advantages of Vladivostock, shall be free from its one deficiency. Their ships have been employed not less actively than our own in surveying the eastern coast of Corea; and it is understood that the place which they consider to best answer their requirements is Port Lazareff in Broughton Bay. This place is situated in Broughton or Yunghing Bay, about halfway between Vladivostock and the southern extremity of the Korean peninsula, and is said to afford deep and safe anchorage at all seasons. Gensan in the same bay is one of the most prosperous and promising ports in the whole Korean peninsula.

There would have been nothing to cause surprise if, during the protracted discussions between Russia and China on the subject of the restoration of Kuldja, the Russians had availed themselves of the excuse of threatened hostilities to occupy some point at Port Lazareff, and establish there a settlement similar to Vladivostock. But that opportunity having been neglected, and Russia having become a contracting party to the treaties by which Corea took her place in the family of nations, it seems impossible for Russia to attempt the realisation of her old project. Not merely would she violate her obligations, but by assailing what are joint rights and privileges she would incur great risk in challenging the adverse opinion of China, Japan, and England. The Russian authorities, while keeping in reserve their original design on Port Lazareff, are most likely to turn their attention to some other spot where they may hope to obtain a naval station always open to the sea. There have been indications in the Russian press, which always manifests remarkable interest in everything affecting the position of affairs in the North Pacific, that the most coveted spot of all is the island of Quelpart. This ambition seems to have taken the place of the old longing for the twin islands Tsushima, where Japanese authority was, until quite recently, feeble in the extreme; but this has been rendered, practically speaking, impossible

by the Mikado garrisoning that island with his own troops in place of the vassals of Satsuma. But if there is a belief that Russia would acquire a valuable naval station in Quelpart, it must be recorded that all the known facts are opposed to this supposition. The island of Quelpart is thickly peopled and well cultivated. The inhabitants, who are chiefly convicts or their descendants deported by the Corean Government, are notorious for their animosity towards foreigners; and the anchorages round the coast are exceedingly dangerous. The best of these is believed to be near Bullock Island, but with certain winds this anchorage cannot be used.

The Russians are therefore so situated that while they have a large military force on the Amour and at Vladivostock, as well as a numerous navy in the North Pacific, they find themselves in a cramped position for the prosecution of aggressive designs and unable to carry on any extensive trade. The present condition of their settlements throughout the whole of East Siberia and its dependencies is simply deplorable. Colonies have been established at different places, but only to decay. The wretched settlers, reduced to the verge of desperation, have had no loophole of safety except by petitioning the Czar to grant unusual privileges and to make exceptional efforts in their behalf. Russian trade can scarcely be said to exist, and since the sale of Alaska to the United States even the fur industry has declined almost to the point of extinction. The prosperity of Vladivostock is quite artificial, arising from the requirements of a large garrison and squadron. Moreover, the trade of the place is entirely in the hands of the Chinese residents, who have flocked thither just as they have done to Saigon and other places in the south. In the North Pacific, as elsewhere, we find that Russia has no contentment in her present possessions. They might prove, under prudent management, revenue-producing countries, but unquestionably the result would have to be one of time and effort, neither of which she seems able to bestow. As the consequence it follows that disappointment with what she possesses engenders the desire to seize places belonging to some one else, but which, as lying nearer to the main routes of trade, seem likely to afford a higher meed of recompense. For the moment it is not too much to say that the further development of Russian power is checked, and only in the event of war with either England or one of the two Asiatic Powers

most directly concerned will it be possible for her to attempt those schemes of aggrandisement in the Corean peninsula which she has been for some years meditating.

The part which the English Government has to play in the future stages of this question ought to be well known, because it is clearly defined. No one can pretend that it has any territorial designs upon Corea, and at some later period of the question it may be found that Li Hung Chang was influenced by the advice of Englishmen when he took what has proved a decisive measure in modern Corean history. At the same time no excessive estimates have been formed as to the future development of Corean trade. The reports of our consuls show not merely that the growth of our commerce in this quarter must prove slow, but that the bulk of the present trade is in the hands of the Japanese. But there can be no hesitation in saying that whatever the possibilities of Corean trade may be, and even if the facts indicated a greater prospect of advantage to Russia than can be said to be the case, there would still remain on the English Government the responsibility to provide against a hostile supremacy in the North Pacific proving injurious to the interests of our commerce in the seas of China and Japan where it has long enjoyed a hard-earned and still keenly contested pre-eminence. The necessity of a naval station in the North Pacific, or at all events of a coaling-place which would supply the want so admirably met by Hongkong in the south, has long been felt and admitted. The repeated declaration of Russia's intentions with regard to Port Jazareff and other places, even although they have not been carried out, could not but invest with increased force and significance the representations of those who declared that there should be a station for the English squadron either in the Gulf of Pechihli or off the coast of Corea. Many places have been suggested for this purpose, but it is not easy to discover one providing the necessary accommodation and possessing the required anchorage, at the same time that it does not constitute a menace to China or a needless interference with the rights of other commercial nations. The desired haven is considered to have been found in Port Hamilton, but some of the highest English naval authorities are disposed to challenge the alleged advantages of this position. However divided opinions may be as to the best spot for a northern Hongkong, few are inclined to deny the necessity of our having such a possession; and although no final decision with regard to Port Hamilton

has yet been taken, a brief description of that natural harbour will be interesting at the present juncture.

The following account of Port Hamilton is taken from the best available source --the nautical publication termed the 'China Pilot':--

'The Nan-how or Ngan-hau group, lying about N.N.E. $\frac{1}{2}$ E., 38 miles from the north-east end of Quelpart, consists of two large islands, deeply indented, the northern parts of which nearly meet, and which with a third and smaller island called Observatory Island, situated between their south-eastern points, form a spacious and well-sheltered harbour named Port Hamilton, the main entrance to which is at the south-east part of the group. These islands may be readily distinguished from the numerous clumps of islets and rocks in the neighbourhood by their greater size and massive bold appearance, as well as their peculiar position. Except at a great distance from the south-eastward, they invariably make as one island. Within Observatory Island a vessel may be safely hove down for repairs. Wood is scarce; fresh water is plentiful and good and easily embarked. Fish may be caught with the seine. Although the natives were friendly, their supplies were too limited, and the surveying vessel "Saracen" could not obtain fresh stock of any description in 1856. The crew roamed over the island as they pleased, but the inhabitants would not allow them to enter their houses. The largest village is in the north-west part of the harbour, and in 1859 it contained 250 inhabitants. The Port Hamilton group, so far as their examination went, is clear of danger on all sides, but is best approached from the south-east. There is also no difficulty in entering the port at night, if the weather be not very thick.'

Port Hamilton has, therefore, some advantages which the better known island of Quelpart does not possess, and the experience of Admiral Wille's squadron when it anchored there two years ago confirms all we have quoted above. It has the safe anchorage and natural harbour which are of the first importance, and at the same time it presents no serious difficulties to occupation. The seizure of Quelpart or Port Lazareff could only be accomplished by a considerable expedition, but the whole of the Nan-how group could be taken possession of by a few marines and a single man-of-war. Moreover it involves no intrusion of Corean rights. The Chinese and Japanese already see that, far from being a danger to their authority, the establishment of an English coaling station in the North Pacific contributes to their security; and whether this position be found at Port Hamilton or some other of the ten thousand isles of the Corean archipelagoes, it will have to be discovered without delay. The tentative measures taken with regard to Port Hamilton

are said to have been displeasing to the Russian Government; but whether their suspicions assumed the form of an official remonstrance or not, there is no doubt that opinion in Russia was more excited over what has been called the Port Hamilton incident than the natural value of the place—which, except as a depôt for coal, is not very great—would justify. During the heat of the discussion about Penjdeh and the Afghan frontier it was curious to observe that while the Russian newspapers said absolutely nothing about the question of the hour they were full of articles protesting against the reported seizure of Port Hamilton. These expressions were marked by considerable knowledge of the leading facts in connexion with the situation in the North Pacific, as well as by shrewdness of argument in making the most of what was termed an English act of aggression as a set-off against their own on the Murghab. But assuming that the Asiatic Government, whose authority over the spot selected is not disputed, gives its sanction, the Russian Government can take no exception to the English providing themselves with the coaling station rendered necessary by the requirements of their squadron in the far East.

The opening of Corea to foreign traders and consuls has given quite a new turn to questions of commercial and maritime advantage in the adjacent seas. It has served to check the schemes of Russian ambition on the mainland, and it has reconciled the rival pretensions of China and Japan. Corea is now launched upon the path of progress, and the rate at which she will advance depends very much on the desire evinced by the people for foreign intercourse and trade enterprise. There are still many difficulties to be overcome. Corea is not an El Dorado, and the people themselves are so apathetic that a long period of time must elapse before they can take any considerable part in raising their own lot or in enhancing the commercial importance of their country. As agriculturists they compare very unfavourably with the Chinese, and as traders they have not the activity or enterprise of the Japanese. The trade returns have so far proved small and disappointing. The only articles which show any elasticity are copper and spirits; and as the former is used for the purpose of coining an artificial and useless currency, and the latter for purposes of intoxication, they will neither contribute to increase the wealth of the country, nor to improve the prospects of the external trade. It is something, however, to learn from our consuls, who cannot be charged with taking too san-

guine a view of the future, that the people of Corea do not show any hostility towards foreigners, and that there are large provinces in the peninsula of the highest natural fertility. The Coreans do not know how to make the most of their resources, and are easily satisfied because of their slender requirements; and it must be a work of time to improve their views and give them a larger idea of the conditions of life.

The security of navigation and trade in the North Pacific is a simple problem which admits of an easy solution provided the two Asiatic powers immediately concerned, and the English Government as representing the bulk of foreign trade in this quarter of Asia, are agreed upon a course of common action. At the present moment this seems to be the case. Both China and Japan are inclined to believe in the identity of their interests, and, more than that, to look to England as their safest friend and protector. From neither is there any likelihood of objection to the necessary measures for placing the English fleet in that advantageous position with regard to the North Pacific which it at present enjoys in the south. A coaling station is the first thing necessary towards the consummation of this wish, and, whether it be found in Port Hamilton or somewhere else, the possession of a safe anchorage and coaling depôt will do much for the tranquillity of the Corean sea. The possession of Vladivostock and the creation of a volunteer fleet by Russia are of comparatively small importance as long as she is confined to those northern coasts and harbours in which there is neither commerce nor any facility for establishing a flourishing dependency. The progress of Corea so happily commenced will be allowed to go on undisturbed, and the commercial energies of those who lead affairs in the Eastern world will find a field of distinction without apprehension of any interference from aggressive nations. So long as the harmony of the courts of China and Japan remains unbroken there will be no need to dwell too emphatically on the nice point of naval and commercial supremacy; but in its own interests as well as in those of China and Japan the Government of England is bound to take all necessary precautions and to ensure as far as lies in its power the peaceful solution of the Corean problem.

ART. XI.—*Parliamentary Debates, 1884–85.*

THE singular events of the last few weeks appeared at one moment to afford materials from which a political dramatist might have constructed a comedy or even a burlesque; but for the credit of the country and of our statesmen these eccentric incidents have gradually subsided into a more regular and decorous solution. We trust, however, that some competent pen will record for the information of future times the curious vicissitudes of this transaction, which will probably not be fully disclosed at present to the world. Yet those passages which are already public and notorious are sufficiently curious and amusing. A resolution was brought forward by a leading member of the Opposition condemning the amended Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, which certainly was not obnoxious to vehement censure. This resolution, however, was intended as a mere passage of arms, for nothing could exceed the surprise, and even consternation, of the victorious Opposition when they found that, by the desertion of the Irish brigade and the abstention of some fifty Liberals, the blow had struck home. It was intended to be a mere scratch on the escutcheon of the Ministry, but the Treasury bench declared it to be a case of life and death, and that the blow was mortal. Evidently, to some members of the Government at least, the hour of dissolution was the hour of deliverance. The Cabinet resigned with the greatest alacrity, and Her Majesty was graciously pleased to accept the resignation of her confidential servants with equal promptitude. Not, however, without having suggested to Mr. Gladstone that he would do well to reconsider his determination; but he intimated that he was precluded from entertaining this proposal, unless Lord Salisbury failed to form a Government. Never certainly had a Ministry suffered extinction with more readiness and satisfaction to its own members and to a large portion of its supporters. Had it been otherwise, the catastrophe might possibly have been averted and a great Administration would not have perished by a snap shot.

But such was the indifference or contempt on both sides for the sweets of office (which had, perhaps, lost something of their flavour), that they were surrendered by one party with eagerness and accepted by the other with trepidation and reluctance. Some of the Conservative leaders doubted the expediency of taking office, and regretted the conse-

quences of Sir Hicks Beach's intempestive victory. All felt that they succeeded to a position of considerable difficulty, with a large adverse majority in Parliament, and no great hope of support from the country. But as they had carried on the siege of the fortress for months and years with indifferent success, they were bound to enter and take possession when it capitulated. An interval of hesitation ensued, for it was not clear that this abrupt capitulation might not turn out to be a bad joke. The enemy might fall back in overwhelming strength on the lines they had just deserted. If the Tories took office at all, Lord Salisbury conceived that they were entitled to ask for terms from the Opposition to enable them to wind up the business of the Session. They contemplate no legislative measures, but a truce was required of sufficient length to enable them to obtain the necessary supplies for sums already expended, it must be remembered, by their predecessors. To this demand Mr. Gladstone returned a somewhat evasive answer, and indeed he had no power to bind the House of Commons to silence: and Lord Salisbury eventually took the Government with no explicit conditions. This, then, is a Vacation Ministry. It is impossible to discuss seriously either its composition or its policy. Many of its members are new to official life, and we feel no confidence in their judgement or moderation; indeed it is not easy to frame a policy *à courte échéance*. Yet there have been examples when a shortlived government struggling against an adverse majority has laid the foundation of a political reputation. Sir Robert Peel's Ministry in 1835 was, perhaps, the most striking period of his life. At the present time any Ministry must have had a provisional and temporary character, depending on the result of the general election in the autumn. That event overshadows everything that may occur in the interval. No great resolution can be taken. No great measure can be proposed or contemplated. For the purpose of carrying on the ordinary functions of executive government, it was perhaps less difficult to frame a government by the Conservative Opposition than to reconstruct the late Ministry.

But if we feel but little interest in the fate of a Cabinet foredoomed, as we believe, to a limited duration, and incapable for that reason of originating any essential policy of its own, we are impressed in the strongest possible manner with the importance of the general state of political opinion and parties in the country, and we would endeavour to look forward to wider and broader combinations than those which

arise out of the incidents or accidents of the present moment. It would seem as if this nation was approaching a crisis of its history—a great parting of the waters—a chasm between the past and the future—a passage from death to life, or possibly, from life to death. We do not refer to the mere transfer of executive power from one party to another, an incident of no uncommon occurrence in our annals; nor to the numerous questions of extraordinary difficulty and complexity which the Queen's Government has to solve abroad and at home—in Ireland, in finance, in Egypt, in the East, and in our relations with foreign powers. The crisis which we see before us is one which threatens the foundations of parliamentary government and shakes our confidence in institutions which have stood the brunt of two centuries, and have carried us triumphantly through greater perils than these.

On the one hand we have a Parliament which will cease to exist for any active purpose within a few weeks of the publication of these lines; which is already demoralised by its approaching dissolution, and agitated by the passions of conflicting factions. A House of Commons on the verge of extinction is equally powerless to support an old Administration which has lost its hold on the majority, or to sustain a new Administration which assumes office without any majority at its command. On the other hand, we have to look forward to a Parliament elected under new and untried conditions; which cannot come into existence for several months; and whose character and composition are altogether unknown. The authority of the political leaders to whom the country has long looked with confidence and hope has been shaken by recent events, and the advanced age of some members of the late Administration makes it improbable that they will continue to exercise much longer their wonted influence on public affairs, although they may take part in the electoral contest. The duties, whether it be of government or opposition, must ere long devolve upon the men of a younger generation; and although we do not question their patriotism or their ability, they are not united by strong personal ties or by an intimate accord on the principles which are the only true and lasting bonds of party connexion. Yet it is to principles and not to persons that we look for the re-establishment of stability in government. The union which is based on nothing stronger than the exigencies of party or personal adherence, and which compels men to give a reluctant assent to a policy or to

measures they secretly disapprove, is a false and artificial union. The strength of a party consists in the strength of its convictions; and convictions are based on principles alone. It therefore becomes a matter of paramount importance to consider and ascertain what are the principles on which the Liberal party of the future will take its stand, and which will be accepted and sanctioned by the votes of the people.

It would not become us to criticise the measures of the late Government, and we shall not attempt so ungracious a task. We leave that to their opponents; but the more we are attached to the principles of Liberal government, and personally to the members of the late Cabinet, the more we regret that the results of their policy have fallen short of the expectations of the country and of their own aspirations—*magnis tamen excidit ansis*. Such a retrospect is of small avail. The past is irrevocable. Much might be said in extenuation of these failures. Ministers had to contend against a long period of agricultural and commercial depression, not peculiar to this country, but apparently common to the world. They succeeded to many embarrassing questions, and, in a word, they have not been fortunate. But the fact remains that they were led by some fatality to leave undone many things which they desired and intended to do, and that they have done many of the things most opposed to their intentions and desires. To quote one example only. No government was ever more opposed to war, blood-shedding, and territorial aggrandisement. They were ready to make any sacrifices to avert such calamities. Yet their administration has been one of almost incessant warfare—in South Africa, in Egypt, in the Soudan—accompanied by the loss of some of the noblest of England's soldiers, and by a frightful waste of human life. And it has terminated by preparations for war upon a still larger scale, which has happily been averted by the patience and forbearance shown in the recent negotiations with Russia, after an act of unprovoked aggression, directed against the territory of our ally the Ameer of Afghanistan. It is not the first time in our history that an extreme desire to maintain peace at almost any price has led to a precisely opposite result, and induced foreign nations to doubt the spirit and the power which this country can and will put forth when its rights and interests are seriously attacked.

Of the Parliament of 1880, which is now approaching the close of its career, we can speak with greater freedom. No

parliament, within our recollection, has been elected with loftier pretensions and expectations at its commencement, and none has left behind it, with two exceptions, less conspicuous results. Its debates have been for the most part turbulent and ineffective. The resolutions which were proposed and carried in an extraordinary autumn session, for the better regulation of its proceedings, appear to have had no marked effect, except by the beneficial establishment of grand committees, on which the work of practical legislation has in part devolved. But even of these we have heard but little in the present Session. The most important measures, such as the Criminal Code, the Establishment of County Boards, the Reform of the City Corporation, the Scottish Universities Bill, the Shipping and Railway Bills, have all been thrown aside as impracticable—not, certainly, for want of any desire on the part of Ministers to carry the measures they had promised and prepared. The consequence is that the House of Commons has lost credit and confidence as a legislative assembly, and there is an increasing tendency to transfer the legitimate authority of Parliament to the vague declamations of the platform, where no debate is possible, or to the arguments of the press. In fact, the representative system itself, which had been regarded as the wisest and most complete invention of modern political science, and the peculiar boast of the British constitution, is threatened with annihilation, if a power is created outside the walls of Parliament to which Parliament itself must yield implicit obedience, and if the representatives of the people, chosen by the nation for their ability and political experience, are degraded into the mere delegates of anonymous associations or popular demonstrations. Such a form of government, if government it can be called, would, in times of excitement, degenerate into mere anarchy, and the demagogue of the hour would reign supreme, not by the authority of the institutions of the realm, but by subjecting those institutions to mere popular impulse and control.

Two exceptions, however, there are to the sterility and vacuity of this Parliament, which will leave their mark in history. Its second session was noted by the passing of the Irish Land Act; its last by the Seats and Redistribution Bills, which have profoundly modified the constitution of the House of Commons. This is not the time or the place to renew the discussion on the political character of these measures. But their social results deserve a passing remark. The effect of the Irish Land Act has been,

by the acknowledgement of a late Irish Secretary, to render the ownership of land unmarketable in Ireland; whilst by a singular anomaly tenant rights are purchased at an extravagant price, showing that the Irish can purchase what they wish to possess and hold. Yet we have recently been told that advances should be made by Government at the expense of the British Treasury to enable Irish tenants to purchase the fee simple of their land, and enable Irish land-owners to find purchasers, although at the same time a powerful party is labouring to bring about the severance of the two countries, which would simply place the investment of the British creditor at the mercy of the Irish debtors. The result may easily be foreseen. The existence of such a debt would supply an additional argument for the repeal of the union, sweetened by the hope of repudiation. The Government has had to struggle for the last five years against a treasonable conspiracy, largely supported by foreign funds, worked by foreign emissaries, and by men who would readily invoke the active assistance of any foreign State that would proclaim its hostility to England. The Irish Nationalists, to give them their due, have never concealed the object of this agitation or disclaimed the execrable means by which they have carried it on. The policy of the Administration has been uniformly one of extreme forbearance and conciliation. The only exceptional measures which have been taken were measures of procedure to defend society against brutal crimes. This policy of concession has not disarmed a single Irish adversary; and with a genuine Hibernian extravagance they continue to describe themselves with impunity as slaves and the victims of tyranny in language which in any other country would send them on their way to Siberia or Cayenne.

The most deplorable result of this system as applied to Ireland is, as we learn, the extinction of that highly honourable and gifted party of the Irish Whigs, to whom the country owed, in the first half of this century, the progress it made in toleration, in freedom, and in prosperity. The descendants of these men and the representatives of their opinions are, we fear, excluded from political life, and even from their just local influence, by the violence of the worst type of demagogues, servile to their master, and insolent to their fellow-countrymen; whilst the connexion of Ireland with the United Kingdom rests on the unshaken fidelity and loyalty of Ulster, and on the determination of Great Britain to uphold the union. It is not a little remarkable that the blow which ejected the late Ministry from office

was struck by the men to whom they had made incalculable sacrifices, and that the Tories owed their victory to a transient combination with a faction to whose principles and conduct they are diametrically opposed. Indeed, the followers of Mr. Parnell are the only body in the House of Commons who have accomplished in this Session all they could desire. They have dethroned Lord Spencer, they have ejected the Ministry, and they are likely to bring about the abandonment of the Act for the Prevention of Crime.

But it was not our intention to dwell on Irish grievances further than to point out that, although the Irish can be governed by a firm and just policy, nothing is to be gained, not even their esteem, their gratitude, or their support, by an attempt to win them by favour. Our object on the present occasion is a different one. We wish to enquire how it has come to pass that an Administration composed of men of high character and ability, headed by the most experienced and eloquent of living statesmen, and animated by generous and liberal sentiments, should have fallen so far short of its own conceptions. It loved peace, but it has had war. It desired economy, but the last Budget rose to the unparalleled sum of a hundred millions. It sought to treat foreign nations in a spirit of justice and consideration, but foreign nations misconstrued the policy, and drew back from our alliance. Some of them appear to have thought that the moment was a favourable one to take advantage of our apparent weakness.

These are strange inconsistencies. They are only to be explained, as we believe, by the inherent inconsistency of the structure of the Administration. Throughout this long effort of five years, the object of the Minister has been to reconcile incongruous and even opposing elements, and to preserve the union of the two sections of the Liberal party, which are in many respects dissimilar. On the main question of retaining the supreme direction of affairs, they uniformly agreed; and the numerous votes of censure moved by the Opposition were invariably repelled and defeated by the firm front of the Ministerial majority. Even those who were least disposed to applaud the policy of Ministers were not prepared to hand over the direction of affairs to their rivals. But the bond of party union extended no further. There was scarcely a question on which the conduct of the Government was not disapproved by one section or another of its supporters. The same differences of opinion must have been felt within the Cabinet, and the result was

a degree of irresolution which involved the policy of the country in endless anomalies and contradictions.

The political creed or articles of faith of the Liberal party are traversed, like the Articles defining the tenets of the Church of England, by two distinct currents of thought; and, in spite of the efforts made to maintain a union between them by every artifice of compromise, they bear the immutable stamp of a different origin and a different object. The tendencies of the one may be termed *positive*, of the other *negative*; the objects of one section are constructive, of the other destructive. The former class of opinions and of statesmen seeks to carry on the secular work of progress and reform by preserving and strengthening the fundamental institutions of the country, and it is to them that we owe the large conquests of the last half-century over prejudice, intolerance, and error. The latter class aims without concealment at the subversion of many of the most cherished of these institutions, without any distinct forecast or knowledge of what is to be substituted for them. We do not hesitate to affirm that the name and spirit of true Liberals belong exclusively to the more temperate politicians of the elder school, and that the spirit of Radicalism is essentially arbitrary and despotic, seeking like the French Jacobins to establish by clamour, agitation, and fear, the ascendancy of a small minority over the great bulk of the nation. This is the true question the country will have to solve at the next election. This is what we have termed the 'parting of the waters.' There is no reason to apprehend that the statesmen of the future will relapse into the errors of an obsolete Toryism. To combat them is to war against ghosts. To do the leaders of the Conservative party no more than justice, they too have moved with the age, and it is idle to impute to them the errors and offences of former generations. We have to look not to the past but to the future.

It seems, therefore, not unnecessary once more to point out the fundamental propositions of the old Liberal creed, and in what they differ from the more violent and extreme outgrowth which the Radical leaders are eager to engraft upon it. And in the front rank we place the greatest amount of individual freedom and independence which can be secured by law to every man, restraining the action and interferences of the Government within the narrowest possible limits. Individual freedom, individual activity, individual competition are the vital forces of society and of life. They are reproduced in a thousand forms—freedom of conscience,

freedom of contract, freedom of trade, resistance to monopolies, exemption from the arbitrary control of associations exercising in the name of popular powers a tyranny more formidable than that of an absolute sovereign. The whole tendency of the extreme party, both in foreign countries and at home, is socialistic. Their object is to subvert and subdue those independent powers which check and counterpoise each other, and to erect in the State a common master of the votes, the property, and the lives of the whole community.

This distinction appears to us to explain the hostility avowed to many of the best established truths of political economy, and the attacks which are not obscurely directed against the rights of property itself. For even property is to be held in subordination to the supreme will of the State, and the supreme will of the State is the caprice or the interest of those who rule it. We are told that land, heretofore regarded as the most tangible and secure form of property, is to be held subject to such conditions as have actually been imposed in Ireland. If so, why not apply the same process of reasoning to the National Debt, a form of property of a much less certain character, and proceed by similar steps to repudiation? There is no tenable distinction between any of the forms of capital, money, loans, funds, land, mills, ships, or trade. To attack one form is to weaken the security of all the others.

To take another point, which the old traditions of the Liberal party regard as of vital importance, and which they defended with vigour and success against O'Connell— we mean the maintenance of the union and of the integrity of the United Kingdom. It is evident, from recent occurrences and declarations, that the Radical leaders are prepared, in order to gain the Irish voter, to concede to the Irish Nationalists what they term 'a large measure of local government,' and to relieve them from those exceptional measures of procedure which are found to be indispensable for the detection and punishment of crime. They tell us they will have no exceptional measures for Ireland, but what is the Land Act but an exceptional measure? what is the comparative exemption from taxation? what are the large grants from the Treasury for services which are paid in England by the rates? Many things in Ireland are exceptional. Crime itself is exceptional, and so is the impunity of criminals and the willing connivance or complicity of the population. Yet this is the point on which the conflicting sections of the late Administration were least able to agree.

The concession of local government to Ireland is a still graver matter, for it is a further step in the direction of Home Rule. Whatever be the powers given to Irish local bodies, this much is certain: they will be used for purposes hostile to England. Forty years ago or more the Irish Municipal Bills were discussed with great animosity in Parliament and carried not without difficulty. We can only say that the composition and conduct of the Irish corporations in such cities as Dublin, Cork, and Limerick, have gone far to justify the sinister predictions of their worst enemies. A local assembly, be it great or small, has no importance beyond its own power to raise money and to control the executive. In order to raise money it must have the power of taxation, and in order to spend it, it must name the executive power. An Irish Parliament, if it were sitting to-morrow, would be nothing without an Irish ministry, and an Irish ministry would be nothing if it had not the taxation and policy of the island at its command. It is needless to add for what purposes they would be used. If, therefore, the extreme party of English politicians are prepared to make any further surrender in this direction, we must infer that they are ready to accept the disintegration of the United Kingdom. Mr. Chamberlain regards the administration of Ireland by the Imperial authority, even of the Government in which he himself bore a part, as analogous to the Austrian rule in Italy, or the Russian dominion in Poland. His language is that of the extremest follower of Mr. Parnell himself. Yet Mr. Chamberlain must be perfectly aware that there is no civil or political right enjoyed by any British subject of which the people of Ireland are deprived, and that these rights are avowedly exercised in a spirit of hostility to the Crown and the Empire. It would even seem from some recent speeches that this extravagant claim for local independent government is not to be confined to Ireland. Scotland is to have a revival of a Scottish Parliament. Wales is to be blessed with a local legislature: and we suppose even England may aspire to the same privilege. In short it is proposed to return to the Heptarchy. Have the authors of these absurd proposals ever asked themselves how and by whom this complicated machinery is to be worked, and what is to be gained by the dissolution of the United Kingdom?

We hold, in direct opposition to the theories of Rousseau, of the French Revolution, and of our modern Radicals, that the inequality of the conditions of human life is an in-

separable consequence of civilisation, and that the more highly civilised a society becomes, the more striking is this inequality. There may be equality among savages. There may be equality in communities degraded by poverty, ignorance, and anarchy. But if the multifarious and diverse calls and duties of social life are to be fulfilled, they require an infinite gradation of classes, occupations, and qualities from the lowest daily task of manual labour to the highest functions of intelligence. This we take to be the order of the world. Men are, in the language of an ancient authority, 'not to covet nor desire other men's goods, but to learn and labour truly to get their own living, and to do their duty in that state of life unto which they are born.' But in this social order of unequal ranks all ranks are alike entitled to the protection of the law, to the same civil rights, and to the respect due to honesty and industry. Hence arises the claim of mutual dependence which is the true bond of society. Neither high nor low, rich nor poor, wise nor uncultured, can exist without mutual support. The true theory of a Christian and civilised State is to strengthen as much as possible these bonds, and to fulfil to the uttermost these mutual duties—in other words, to establish the closest union between capital and labour, between the employer and the employed, between the landowner, the farmer, and the labourer, between the head which directs and supplies motive power, and the hand which executes the work. With these conditions society may attain the highest degree of order, prosperity, and contentment of which it is capable. Without them it will be agitated, unsettled, impoverished, and eventually destroyed.

To these views the Radicalism of the present day is entirely opposed. Its object is avowedly to set class against class, to raise envy, covetousness, and discontent into political factors, to inflame the worst passions of democracy, and to delude the masses with popular fallacies, which would in the end be fatal to themselves. The real incentive to this species of agitation is the passionate desire to win notoriety and power, even by the most unworthy means. But all such artifices are condemned by the old traditions and the true spirit of the Liberal party. We cannot be associated with declamation which we know to be false, or with pretended schemes which we believe to be mischievous and impracticable. Be the consequences what they may, we reject them.

To take another instance which we cannot pass over in silence. These agitators have not scrupled to take advantage of the wild and mischievous theories propagated by Mr.

Henry George, with some rhetorical talent, and to lead ignorant audiences to suppose that there is some mysterious property in the possession of land. The argument is the more absurd because it is commonly addressed to townspeople who are never likely to have any connexion with agricultural land, and who would not know what to do with it if they possessed it. For the mere possession of land is of no value at all without the conditions that render it a source of profit, and these are numerous. Land is an element of nature that renders back with increase what is put into it; but to obtain any produce from it at all many things are requisite—labour, buildings, machinery, manure, seed, stock, all of which require capital or credit. The owner of land without capital is one of the most wretched of human beings, for he requires advances he cannot make, and he has to meet charges he cannot pay. That is the reason why in this country the numbers of small landowners has diminished. They found that they could not make it answer, or that much better investments were to be had for their money. A meritorious attempt is now being made to facilitate the purchase of small holdings of land. We are extremely glad that such an experiment should be tried. There is plenty of land for sale to those who can pay for it, at even a low valuation. But to be sound and successful such an investment must be *real*, and not a thinly disguised form of debt or charity.

Another favourite topic is the Game Laws, which are denounced by people who know nothing of game, except what they see in the poulterers' shops. We sincerely desire that game should be subject to the same laws which protect property in ducks or geese or any other living thing, and we desire no other protection; but there is no reason why it should be less protected. The abolition of property in game would simply lead to the extermination of game itself: that is to say, the nation would lose a considerable supply of food, which is sold for less than it costs, a large body of active men would be thrown out of employment, and a source of health and pleasure would be destroyed to gratify the passions of those who do not share in these pursuits.

Another favourite subject is the burden of taxation and the amount of public expenditure. Of all the pretensions of democratic government none is more false than that it is cheap. It is the dearest in the world, because the claims made on the Treasury or the public purse in the name of the sovereign people are irresistible. The two great Republics of the United States and France enjoy the sinister privilege

of supporting the largest debts that ever existed and the heaviest amount of interest—far exceeding that National Debt of England, after twenty years of war, which was formerly the wonder of the world. Our own popular municipalities are following in the same track. They have created a debt of 150 millions sterling in the last few years, and by their prodigality they have raised the local rates to the level of imperial taxation. In point of fact, the Government of the country is the only power which really seeks, not to spend, but to limit expenditure, and it is generally defeated in its efforts by powers not within its control. The reason is obvious. The number of those who hope to profit by this lavish expenditure far exceeds the number of those who have to pay it, and the public revenue is regarded as the available fortune of the public to meet any species of popular demand.

Such are some of the topics—we must say the paltry and delusive topics—which are used to call down a cheer from popular meetings, where, as in the Jacobin Clubs of France, any man may be applauded who will cast a stone at his neighbour. They derive their importance from the spirit in which they are urged. As measures of social reform and improvement, all suggestions tending to improve the condition of the people are welcome and laudable; as means of warfare, to promote disunion and inflame discontent, designed not so much to raise what is lowest as to pull down what is highest in the commonwealth, they are detestable.

A cry has gone forth from France, where they have most experience of the matter, that the nineteenth century has been an age of deceptions, and that the most cruel of these delusions is the belief that Liberty and Democratic Government mean the same thing. They not only do not mean the same thing, but they are radically opposed, and Liberty has more to fear in this age from Democracy than from any other cause. Liberty is based on the free action of co-ordinate powers, mutually checking and controlling each other; Democracy claims an absolute supremacy and undivided authority, which is the soul of despotism. Liberty respects and protects all personal and corporate rights, even when they are opposed to the action of the State; Democracy crushes all resistance to its own pleasure. Liberty is the child of law, Democracy of lawlessness. Liberty is patient, tolerant, and enduring; Democracy arrogant and impetuous. Liberty can only exist with order and peace; the path of Democracy is stained with blood, for it leads to deeds of violence and civil war.

These are the issues which the country will be called upon, ere long, by its votes, to try. We do not doubt that the voice of the people of England is, on the whole, and indeed unanimously, favourable to Liberal government. There is no question of reaction or reactionary principles. But Liberal government is an expression susceptible of various senses. Even the Tories profess to give it us, and are not altogether insincere in their professions, since many of the most important Liberal measures have been carried by Tory ministers. The Radical party are attempting to extend the Liberal creed far beyond the cause of legitimate reform, and to bring about changes which would affect not only the political institutions but the social conditions and even the union of these kingdoms. The question is whether the great body of Liberal electors, both of the middle classes and the towns as represented by the older electorate, and by the large addition in the counties and smaller towns made by the recent Act, are prepared to accept or promote such changes. Are they prepared to yield to the Irish in their cry for separation, for to that Mr. Chamberlain's recent declarations evidently tend? Are they prepared to join in an attack on the Established Churches of Scotland and England? In Scotland, at least, a strong unequivocal answer has been given to this question by some of the stoutest Liberals amongst us, and we doubt not that in England the Church Establishment will find some of its most strenuous supporters in the Liberals, and some of the advocates of Disestablishment among the Tories. Are they prepared to shake the authority of the Second Chamber, and to throw supreme and undivided powers into the hands of a single democratic assembly without any of the restrictions existing even in Republican States? Would not extreme legislative measures in the one House provoke a collision with the other House, which the Radical party are not anxious to avoid? Would not such an amount of organic change affect the stability of the monarchy itself and entirely overthrow the balance of the Constitution?

These are the questions we would willingly put to the electoral body, and especially to the Liberal part of it. We do not believe that these revolutionary propositions are in accordance with the Liberal opinions of the country. On the contrary the agitation, which will doubtless be got up by Radical partisans, is essentially artificial, and will probably collapse at a signal like the absurd demonstrations of last autumn.

It is evident that the Radical leaders in the House of

Commons, some of whom were members of the Cabinet whose actions they now repudiate and condemn, were eager to destroy the existing combination and to publish their own free and undiluted programme to the world. Their expectation is that it will be accepted, and if accepted will place them in possession of supreme power. We are not sorry that the issue should be fairly tried; and in spite of all the arts and artifices of organisation designed to coerce the free expression of opinion, we trust that the independent judgement of the Liberal constituencies will not submit to be enslaved and perverted by opinions they do not share. For if they carried their point and succeeded for a time in forcing their measures upon the country, we should confidently predict that a reaction would ensue singularly unfavourable to the Liberal cause. The authors of this scheme have neither the character, the honesty, nor the talent to carry it into execution, and they shelter themselves behind the great name and influence of Mr. Gladstone to give them a strength which is not their own.

In conclusion, we would observe that the most essential and important duty devolving at this moment on the electorate is the choice of candidates. The withdrawal of a large number of members from the expiring House of Commons, and the chances afforded by an extended electorate and the redistribution of seats, have thrown open the lists to a crowd of adventurers, place-hunters, and mere party agitators, who have no claim to represent the people of England, and who in fact would represent nothing but themselves. Never was there a moment when it was more desirable to send to the House of Commons men of character, independence, and principle. Their personal qualities are of even more moment than their political opinions. We want men of higher gifts and a nobler spirit than a mere servile adherence to party organisation; for upon the choice of the representatives of the people in this next Parliament depend in no small degree the welfare, the security, and the honour of the nation.

THE
EDINBURGH REVIEW,
OCTOBER, 1885.

No. CCCXXXII.

ART. I.—*English Men of Letters, edited by John Morley.*—*Coleridge.* By H. D. TRAILL. London: 1884.

COLERIDGE has hitherto found no biographer. His work, like his career, was incomplete. De Quincey says, half in jest, that opium-eaters finish nothing, and Coleridge's writings are either unfinished, or 'prolegomena' to some greater plan. His thoughts are scattered, like Sibylline leaves, to the winds, and no hand can now piece together the detached fragments. The same destiny of incompleteness pursued him after death. Green, his literary executor, died without concluding his task: only one volume of Gillman's 'Life' ever appeared; Cottle's gossiping 'Reminiscences,' Carrlyon's 'Early Years and Late Reflections,' Allsop's 'Letters and Correspondence,' De Quincey's brilliant biographical notices, touch only on isolated portions of his career; Mr. Traill's skilful sketch makes no pretension to completeness. It is the more remarkable that no complete biography of Coleridge has appeared, because both his life and character offer points for artistic portraiture. In his career little is to be found of that prose which characterises the lives of many men of letters. It is romantic, full of contrasts of light and shade, containing episodes which excite contempt and pity, disgust and admiration.

His boyhood was passed in those eventful years which, like the surge rolled on shore by a ground-swell, foretold the fury of the revolutionary tempest yet lingering beyond the horizon; his youth and manhood in the very centre of the storm; his old age among the ruins it had caused. In his 'myriad-sided' mind were reflected many of the poetical

critical, religious, philosophical, and political tendencies of the period. Others represent this or that influence more fully: no one was to so great an extent the intellectual epitome of the times as Coleridge. His position was in another respect peculiar. He was in the van both of the attack and the defence. He passed over from the philosophy of Locke, Hartley, and Hume to idealism, from the destructive to the constructive side of politics, from scepticism to spiritual religion. He thus sums up in himself both the present fury and the subsequent effect of the storm. He is at once the living tradition of dispersed illusions and the impersonation of a new creed. With something of the patriarchal air of those who knew the sweetness of life before the French Revolution, he is yet intensely modern.

His influence on the thoughts of cultivated men was wide and varied. Wordsworth's saying has often been repeated, that many men of his age had done wonderful things, but that Coleridge was the only wonderful *man* he had ever known. Southey, no lenient critic, considered his mind 'infinitely, and ten thousand thousand fold the mightiest of his generation.' De Quincey speaks of him as 'the largest and most spacious intellect, the subtlest and most comprehensive, in my judgment, that has yet existed among men.' He answered to Hazlitt's 'idea of a man of genius.' Sir Humphry Davy 'looked to his efforts, as to the efforts of a creating being.' Charles Lamb saw in him 'an archangel—a little damaged.' Scott, Byron, Irving, Christopher North, and even Carlyle, acknowledged the magic of his influence. Arnold considered him the greatest intellect that England had produced within his memory. Hare speaks of him as 'the true sovereign of modern English thought.' Sterling and Maurice and Cardinal Newman are agreed that he breathed a new life into spiritual ideas, and deepened and freshened the current of religious thought. Lastly, may be quoted the striking testimony of Mill: 'No Englishman, Bentham excepted, has left his impress so deeply in the opinions and mental tendencies of those among us who attempt to enlighten practice by philosophical meditation.'

Political prophecy must be based, according to Bacon, on the study of the speculative opinions of the day. On this ground Mill foretold for Coleridge a posthumous fame which in splendour should far exceed his immediate reputation. Many of the conflicts, bequeathed to their successors by the generation to which Coleridge belonged, are being fought on lines which he traced; yet his name is rarely mentioned.

Some reasons for this comparative obscurity are obvious. His teaching was mainly oral; his sayings passed into circulation without that impress of his image and superscription which printing stamps on the coinage of the brain. He has been called 'the greatest seminal mind' of his generation: but he sowed broadcast, not in drills. His books are as unattractive as his voice was fascinating. He who instructs the world must use the world's dialect; but involved sentences, algebraical formulas, approximate expressions, and a technical phraseology, which Swift would have denounced as Babylonish, repel even students from his philosophy. His thoughts are in matter suggestive beyond those of other men; but in form they are often jottings in the margins of favourite books. In much of his work he was anticipated, or his name overshadowed, by the great German thinkers. Judged merely as an interpreter of their philosophy, he is surpassed in clearness and grace by Cousin and the French school. He had not the genius of system; but his reputation suffered less from this defect than from his independence. No political party, no school of philosophy, no religious sect can claim him unreservedly as their own. He supported his political conclusions with arguments which both sides distrusted: while he tolerated no opinions or institutions merely on the ground of their existence, he wholly excluded the people from government. To him religion and philosophy seemed inextricably connected, but his services were acceptable to neither. His philosophy moved in places too deep and high for the English mind, and he was called a mystic. The principles on which his own devotional feelings enabled him to found a spiritual religion led others into unbelief or destructive scepticism. Never a partisan, he neither awakened uncompromising enthusiasm, nor made his name a rallying-point. Thus he founded no school, though he taught the teachers of many.

The philosophy of Locke—clear, sensible, practical—struck its roots deeply in the congenial soil of the eighteenth century. A mechanical utilitarian spirit everywhere pervaded; society banished enthusiasm from religion, politics, and literature, and took its ease. As the century progressed, two new forces, the scientific and the industrial, breathed fresh life into the nation. Manufacture and agriculture, and with them population, advanced by leaps and bounds. In England material progress affected politics more silently than in France or in America; but its influence was scarcely less deep. Equally strong was the scientific impulse.

Science, satirised by Butler, ridiculed by Swift, Arbuthnot, and Pope, shook off its dilettantism, and became a power. The period was the seedtime of theories on the continuity of human progress; it witnessed the first attempts to explore scientifically our complex civilisation. The mental attitude of inquirers became scientific; clearness was demanded; antiquity as well as authority was thrust aside; where no light could be procured reality was denied; whatever was inexplicable was pronounced worthy of destruction. To every form of national life science and industrial development gave impulse or direction; alone or in combination they changed the current of contemporary thought. It has been said that Coleridge represented the characteristic tendencies of the day. He laboured to convert criticism into a science, to found a philosophy of history; he combatted that literary bigotry, confirmed by social panic, which confounded novelty with subversion. But the remark is best illustrated from politics, religion, and poetry. Politically the new forces threatened the existing organisation of society. In France a terrible grandeur is given to the work of destruction by the concentrated enthusiasm of unanimity. Amid the crash of the falling edifice of Church and State, no doubt impaired Coleridge's confidence in the new Apocalypse. Then succeeded despondency; and finally the confession 'the old was better.' The shock drove him to conservatism; but it was conservatism of a new type. He still submitted established institutions and received opinions to the test of scientific inquiry; but his object was to justify their continuance by demonstrating the living value of the principles they embodied. Before the eighteenth century philosophy and science acknowledged the supremacy of theology; now they renounced their allegiance. Churchmen either struggled to maintain the alliance or accentuated the hostility. The one school dismissed *à priori* arguments for the existence of God, and substituted for the vividness of the anthropomorphic conception the impalpable figment of a First Cause. They condemned belief in the spiritual world as fanatical, authenticated Christianity by miracles, treated morality as the synonym of worldly prudence, not as the indication of the hidden laws of spiritual being. The other school opposed the Church to the world, banished æsthetic culture, severed religion from philosophy, science, art, and literature. They kept alive the dying embers of religious fervour, but at heavy cost. Their creed was hard, narrow, unintellectual: their God a gloomy tyrant. Coleridge was too honest and too logical an

inquirer to accept in its entirety the teaching of either school. He had no 'negative capability.' Yet, if he doubted, his doubt was of the mind, not of the will; he was attracted by no love of singularity. His own personal experiences drove him from Unitarianism, and possibly scepticism, to the Christian religion. Having stood both within and without the circle of Christianity, he struggled during the last thirty years of his life to spiritualise philosophy, and harmonise it with a spiritual religion, which recognised the continuity of human progress, excluded no phase of human life, and left untouched no side of human nature. In the poetry both of man and of nature, he struck the new note with no faltering hand. Pope treats Nature as a mighty plan of which the great First Cause was the author. To her charms he is blind; he is never a lover, rarely even an admirer. But, as the century advanced, poetry passed from court and city into a larger and purer air, which inspired a stronger feeling for the natural world than the faded sentimentalism of pastorals or the dainty interest of scholars; Mopsus and Menalcas proved not to be the real inhabitants of rural districts. The revolt against artificial conventionalities of representation, the growing sympathy with rustic life, the spell of the law of nature, led men to invest Nature with mortal attributes and worship in her sequestered shrines. The idea of Nature as a living personal being inspired the reverence of Wordsworth, stirred the introspective mind of Coleridge, and culminated in the sensuous passion of Keats. But it was the subjective side of the poetical movement which Coleridge most strongly represented. Pope studied men rather than mankind, classes not humanity. His was a critical interest in fashionable persons of the day. But Cowper and Burns were poets of the people. Their sympathy with suffering is passionate; they raise their cry against oppression, stir the poor to a sense of their own dignity, value at their true worth the gold and guinea stamp. It was but a short step further to the conception of universal humanity, the brotherhood of nations which Coleridge hoped to see realised in the French Revolution. Didactic poetry contented a cold philosophical age. But amid the stir and ferment of Coleridge's day, when men thought and felt intensely, lyric verse at once found her cradle and held her festival.

Coleridge's literary career closely reflects the external facts of each of the three periods into which his life may be divided. The poetical period, ending in 1799, embraces his

hopeful youth; the critical period from 1799 to 1816 bears the impress of his desultory manhood; the theological period extends from 1816 to 1834, when, after his self-conquest, he devoted himself almost exclusively to studies which had always rivetted his attention.

Samuel Taylor Coleridge was born at the Vicarage of Ottery St. Mary's on October 21, 1772. His father, the Rev. John Coleridge, vicar of the parish, and headmaster of the grammar school, was a simple, kindly man of the type of Parson Adams, a Hebrew scholar, and the author of several unsaleable works. He was twice married. By his second wife, Anne Bowden, he had ten children, of whom the youngest was Samuel Taylor.

Young Coleridge 'never,' as he writes of himself, 'thought 'as a child, never had the language of a child;' he dreamed away his childhood with 'Tom Hickathrift,' 'Jack the 'Giant Killer,' and the seven champions of Christendom. Living much with his elders, he turned 'from life in motion 'to life in thought and sensation.' His sister Ann was his 'playmate when we were both clothed alike.' With her death the chief link with home was severed. Yet the memory of his

' Sweet birthplace, and the old church tower
Whose bells, the poor man's only music, rang
From morn to evening all the hot fair day,'

stirred him throughout life. The river Otter was his favourite haunt and refuge. In a passion he once attacked his brother Frank with a knife. To escape a flogging he ran away along the river bank, till, tired and terrified, he lay down by the stream, and slept through a rough October night. Of all those scenes of childhood which stole into his mind as he lay dying, like 'breezes from the spice islands,' the Otter was the most vivid impression. After the lapse of 'many 'various fated years,' he never closed his eyes

' Amid the sunny ray,
But straight with all their tints thy waters rise,
Thy crossing plank, thy marge with willows gray,
And bedded sand that, veined with various dyes,
Gleamed through thy bright transparence.'

Among these surroundings he grew up a solitary, self-concentrated, passionate child, gifted with a prodigious memory, but vain, dreamy, desultory.

In 1781 his father died. In the following year he entered Christ's Hospital. The school was a rough nursing-mother.

It was now that he commenced his lifelong friendship with Charles Lamb. Under Field lower schoolboys lived 'careless 'as birds,' and Coleridge was free to indulge his passion for miscellaneous reading. He commanded an unlimited supply of books. Wandering alone through London streets, he was mistaken for a pickpocket, when he imagined himself 'Leander swimming the Hellespont.' His captor was sufficiently interested in his prisoner to subscribe for him to a library. He soon exhausted the catalogue. 'My whole 'being,' he says, 'was to crumple myself up in a sunny 'corner, and read, read, read.' Before his fifteenth year, poetry, history, and novels had become insipid, metaphysics and theology alone interested him. He loved to reason 'high'

'On Providence, foreknowledge, will and fate,
Fix'd fate, free-will, foreknowledge absolute,'

with any 'passenger dressed in black' whom he could arrest in the street. Nor did he neglect his classics. Middleton, then a Grecian, afterwards Bishop of Calcutta, found the lower-school boy, his breeches unbuttoned, his shoes down at heel, reading Virgil in play-hours for pleasure. He reported the fact to the head-master. Henceforward he was under the eye and hand of Bowyer, whom he describes as the 'Hercules Furens of the Phlogistic sort.' Though Coleridge received many a flogging from the Doctor, with a cut thrown in for his ugliness, he respected the sound sense of the stern disciplinarian. From him he learned to appreciate simplicity, to abominate Parnassus, Hippocrene, and Pierian springs. His attempt to escape from Christ's Hospital as a cobbler's apprentice failed ignominiously. But Crispin soon gave place to Luke as his patron saint. He became 'wild to be apprenticed to a surgeon. English, 'Latin, yea, Greek books of medicine read I incessantly.' From physiology he passed to Voltaire's 'Philosophical 'Dictionary,' and posed as an infidel. For once Bowyer forgot his maxim, 'Nihil est in intellectu nisi prius in sensu'—'you must lay it in at the tail before you can get it into 'the head'—and tried to flog infidelity out of Coleridge. To this period belongs Lamb's sketch of Coleridge, 'logician, 'metaphysician, bard,' the 'inspired charity-boy,' the 'young Mirandula' who entranced passers-by as he unfolded 'in his deep and sweet intonations the mysteries of 'Iamblichus and Plotinus.' His learning and originality, his 'tall and striking person,' records another schoolfellow,

‘commanded the deference of his companions.’ Always at the head of his class, he was indefinitely beyond them in miscellaneous reading. For mathematics he had no taste. ‘The neglect of them,’ said Roger Bacon, ‘is the work of ‘Satan,’ and to Coleridge they would have afforded invaluable training. He had now burst forth into the exuberance of animal spirits. Of common prudence he was ignorant. He swam the New River in his clothes, and remained in them till night with the result that ‘full half the time from ‘seventeen to eighteen’ he ‘passed in the sick ward of ‘Christ’s Hospital, afflicted with jaundice and rheumatic ‘fever.’ Now began his ‘era of love.’ From metaphysics and theology he turned to poetry. Whether Bowles’s sonnets contributed so powerfully to the change as Coleridge afterwards imagined may be fairly questioned.

In February 1791 he entered at Jesus College, Cambridge. Middleton, to whom he owed his first introduction to Bowyer and Bowles’s ‘Sonnets,’ was still at Pembroke College. Under his influence Coleridge’s university career opened well. But his interest was soon diverted to politics. He devoured every pamphlet that appeared, repeating in the evening what he had read in the morning. In 1793 he threw away all chance of a Fellowship by avowing himself a Unitarian, and narrowly escaped expulsion from his college for cheering Fren^d on his trial before the university authorities.

Middleton had now left Cambridge; Coleridge’s political and religious views jarred with his surroundings; he had been twice disappointed in university competitions; he had contracted some trifling debts; he had been refused by Miss Mary Evans, ‘quam afflictim et perditè amabam, yea, even ‘to anguish.’ During the October term, 1793, in an aimless fit of despondency, he wandered up to London and enlisted in the 15th Dragoons. The episode is employed by Charles Lloyd in his novel of ‘Edmund Oliver.’ Ultimately his friends procured his discharge, and he returned to Cambridge.

In June 1794 he started on a walking tour in Wales, taking Oxford on his way. At Balliol he was introduced to Southey. Both young men were poets, philosophers, and enthusiasts for the French Revolution. Southey, like his contemporary Landor, signified his republicanism by his dress. Coleridge, who was two years older than Southey, embraced the new doctrines with equal ardour. His wide reading, fertile imagination, and charm of voice and manner

made him a fascinating companion. Among the airy creations of his brain was the project of Pantisocracy, or emigration to America. Cowley intended to retire to the New World with his books. Plotinus asked Gallienus to grant him a deserted town in Campania which he might people with philosophers. But the modern Pantisocrats were to reclaim the forest, build for themselves, till the ground, and yet find time for poetry: they were to combine the innocence of the patriarchal age with the refinements of European civilisation. Southey was fascinated with the idea. In America he could sit unelbowed by kings and aristocrats. The Garden of Eden was to be renewed on the banks of the Susquehannah. Coleridge selected the river partly for its association with Wyoming, partly for the poetic sonorousness of the name. Of its exact position he was uncertain. 'It is a grand river in America,' was his reply to geographical inquirers. Before the two Pantisocrats parted, they had agreed to meet at Bristol to arrange the details of the scheme. They already had two companions, Robert Lovell, a poetical Quaker, and George Burnett, the son of a Somersetshire yeoman. Favel and Le Grice, two Christ's Hospital boys of nineteen, and Shadrach Weeks, the servant lad of Southey's aunt, also became Pantisocrats. 'Shad goes with us; he is my brother,' announced Coleridge in capital letters. They hoped that Dr. Priestley might join the party. Five more recruits and two thousand pounds were still required. Southey and Coleridge were to work hard to procure both. Lovell was married to Mary Fricker, the daughter of a Bristol sugar-boiler; Coleridge, Southey, and Burnett proposed to three of her unmarried sisters. Burnett was refused by Martha Fricker; but Coleridge became engaged to Sara, and Southey to Edith. In October Coleridge returned to Cambridge to finish his 'Translations from Modern Latin Poets,' for which he had already secured subscribers. It was now that he published the 'Fall of Robespierre.' But he found it hard to recruit Pantisocrats among men who fled from him because they 'could not answer for their sanity sitting beside a mad man of genius.' His wild talk at last drew forth the remonstrance of the master; Coleridge declared himself 'neither Jacobin nor Democrat, but Pantisocrat, and for ever left the friendly cloisters and happy groves of quiet, ever-honoured Jesus College, Cambridge.'

The Christmas of 1794 Coleridge spent in London, writing neither to Southey nor to Sara Fricker. He would not,

Southey believed, have returned to Bristol if he had not been fetched back. For the attractions of his conversation, the landlord of the 'Cat and Salutation,' in Newgate Street, offered him free quarters. There he spent his evenings with Charles Lamb in speculating 'on golden days to come on 'earth,' and 'drinking egg-hot, and smoking Oronooko.' At last Southey came himself to London, and brought Coleridge back to Bristol. To this circumstance Coleridge probably alluded when he told De Quincey that his marriage was 'not his own deliberate act, but was in a manner forced upon 'his sense of honour by the scrupulous Southey, who insisted 'that he had gone too far in his attentions to Miss Fricker 'for any honourable retreat.'

Neither Pantisocracy nor marriage was feasible without money. Southey had been introduced by Lovell to Cottle, the Bristol publisher :

'Not he whom the Edda made famous,
But Joseph of Bristol, the brother of Amos.'

Cottle now offered Southey fifty guineas for 'Joan of Arc,' and Coleridge thirty guineas for a volume of poems, many of them as yet unfinished. Even with this success, lecturing offered speedier prospects of money-making. The two friends determined to give courses. Coleridge chose political and moral subjects. His third and fourth lectures, delivered in February 1795, were published as 'Conciones ad Populum,' two others appeared under the title of 'The Plot Discovered.' These anti-Pittite harangues rivalled in their violence the language of Muir or Palmer. Coleridge's next course was theological. Both sets of lectures were profitable. Had he possessed ordinary resolution, he might have secured independence; but his vacillation, which showed itself in his walk, was fatal to success. His carelessness in dress attested the irregularity of his character. At school he was a sloven; at college his torn gown provoked the jeers of undergraduates and the reproof of the master; as a dragoon he recognised his carbine by its accumulations of rust. Without the power of self-direction, he already showed a lawlessness which differed from the eccentricity of genius. Whether his engagement was to dine, lecture, or complete stipulated work, he was equally unreliable. During these early months of 1795 he had become deeply attached to Sara Fricker. Cottle, despairing of the poems for which he had paid in advance, offered Coleridge a guinea and a half for every hundred lines which he wrote after completing his under-

taking. The offer seemed a gold mine. Secure of a livelihood, he married Sara Fricker on October 4, 1795. In a tiny cottage at Clevedon, he wrote verses to his wife, which at least prove his happiness. Meanwhile the Transatlantic dream faded before the realities of life. Southey was the first to abandon the scheme. Coleridge's Pantisocratic ardour had already cooled; but he chose to denounce Southey in language so unmeasured as to create a quarrel between the two friends.

Early in 1796 Coleridge once more settled in Bristol. Innumerable plans were before him, but no definite object. He read Cottle a list of eighteen works, several of them in quarto, which he had resolved to write. Dilatory, unmethodical, fastidious, he was ill suited to be an author by trade. Of all his projects, the 'Watchman,' 'a miscellany,' 'which was to supply the place of a newspaper, review, and 'annual register,' was the wildest. With characteristic impetuosity, he left Bristol, in January 1796, to canvass for subscribers. His narrative of his tour is inimitably told in the 'Biographia Literaria.' Unbusinesslike though he was, no better canvasser could have been found; his brilliant conversation proved an admirable advertisement. He returned to Bristol with a thousand names on his list. The first number of the 'Watchman' appeared on March 1; the tenth and last on May 13. From the first it satisfied no one. He lost five hundred orthodox subscribers by an article on fasting, prefaced with the text, 'Wherefore my bowels shall 'sound like a harp.' He disgusted his revolutionary supporters by advocating the gagging bills.

The publication of his poems, and the collapse of the 'Watchman,' left him again in uncertainty. All his plans failed; he was 'in a quickset hedge of embarrassments.' From pecuniary difficulties he was unexpectedly relieved. Charles Lloyd, the son of a Birmingham banker, who preferred literature to business, proposed to come and live with Coleridge. The offer was accepted, and Coleridge moved to Kingsdown, where his son Hartley was born. He did not stay there long. A tanner named Poole, a rich bachelor of literary tastes, living in an old-fashioned house at Nether Stowey, near Bridgwater, was one of his intimate friends. Failing to raise an annuity for Coleridge, Poole offered him a house near his own under the Quantock Hills. To Nether Stowey, Coleridge, with his wife and child and Lloyd, removed at the end of 1796. Here were spent some of the happiest and most productive months of his life. Here

Burnett lived almost entirely with him; here he entertained Thelwall; here, shortly after the domestic tragedy which marred their lives, Charles and Mary Lamb were his guests; here, later, Hazlitt was invited. Coleridge busied himself with French and German and other literary work. He contributed revolutionary effusions to papers apostrophised in the 'New Morality:'

'Couriers and Stars, sedition's evening host!
Thou Morning Chronicle and Morning Post.'

At Sheridan's request he commenced a tragedy, called 'Osorio.' He was diffident of his powers. Even when the play was finished, he submitted it to the judgement of Bowles and Southey. The piece was rejected by Sheridan; but in 1813, through the influence of Byron, it was acted at Drury Lane under the title of 'Remorse.' He added new verses to the second edition of his 'Juvenile Poems,' which appeared in 1797. A few poems were inserted by Lamb and Lloyd. This literary partnership probably occasioned a quarrel between the three friends, which Coleridge attributed to three parodies written by him upon their respective styles. Lamb wrote Coleridge a bitterly ironical letter, and Lloyd left his house. To compensate the loss occasioned by Lloyd's departure, Coleridge contemplated becoming a Unitarian minister. On his 'Watchman' tour he had united preaching with his canvass. His *début* as a preacher had been previously made at Bath. He drove over with Cottle from Bristol, refused to wear 'a rag of the woman of Babylon,' mounted the pulpit in his blue coat and white waistcoat, and preached on the Corn Laws and the Hair Powder Tax. He now offered himself for a vacancy which had occurred at Shrewsbury. Hazlitt, whose father was the minister of Wem, a neighbouring town, saw Coleridge arrive by the coach early in 1798, 'a round-faced man, in a short black coat like a shooting-jacket, which hardly seemed made for him, talking at a great rate to his fellow-passengers. He did not cease to talk,' adds Hazlitt, 'while he stayed, nor has he since that I know of.' To hear him preach, Hazlitt rose before daylight on a January morning, and walked ten miles through the mud. When he arrived,

'The organ was playing the Hundredth Psalm, and when it was done Mr. Coleridge arose and gave out his text: "He departed again into a mountain by himself alone." As he gave out this text his voice rose like a steam of distilled perfumes, and when he came to the last two words, which he pronounced loud, deep, and distinct, it seemed to me—who was then young—as if the sound had echoed from the

bottom of the human heart, and as if that prayer might have floated in solemn silence through the universe. The preacher then launched into his subject, like an eagle dallying with the wind. . . . I could not have been more delighted if I had heard the music of the spheres. Poetry and Philosophy had met together, Truth and Genius had embraced, under the eye and sanction of religion.'

Through Poole, Coleridge had been introduced to the two brothers Josiah and Thomas Wedgwood. At this crisis of his life, they offered him an annuity of 150*l.* a year, to give him leisure for literature. Coleridge accepted the offer, refused the invitation to Shrewsbury, and returned to Nether Stowey.

Wordsworth and his sister were now living at Alfoxden, two or three miles from Coleridge. In 1795, after months of roving, Wordsworth settled at Racedown, in Dorsetshire. There Coleridge, who, while at Cambridge, had been delighted with the 'Evening Walk,' made his acquaintance. The two poets became firm friends. Each had traversed fields of thought unknown to the other. Coleridge, conversant with philosophical systems, was astonished at the poetry which Wordsworth elicited from common objects. Wordsworth, full of observations of nature, was dazzled by his friend's intellectual display. None of Coleridge's published works do justice to the range of his knowledge, or the suggestiveness of his talk in the days when he still believed himself to be a spoilt child of nature. His mental gifts, then in their fullest bloom, were enhanced by an eloquent tongue; his thoughts, not yet monopolised by 'metaphysics' 'at a loss,' did not always 'wander in a wilderness of moss.' 'His conversation teems,' wrote Miss Wordsworth, 'with soul, mind, and spirit. Then he is so benevolent, so good-tempered, and cheerful; and, like William, interests himself so much about every little trifle.' Miss Wordsworth at first thought him plain, but as soon as he spoke she forgot his 'wide mouth, thick lips, bad teeth, and longish, 'loose, half-curling, rough black hair.' 'His complexion' struck Hazlitt as 'clear, and even bright. His forehead was 'broad and high, light as if built of ivory, with large projecting eyebrows, and his eyes rolling beneath them like a 'sea, with darkening lustre. His mouth was gross, voluptuous, open, eloquent; his chin, good-humoured, and round; 'but his nose, the rudder of the face, the index of the will, 'was small, feeble. . . .' To be near Coleridge, Wordsworth moved to Alfoxden. They roved together over 'seaward 'Quantock's heathy hills,' or loitered 'mid her sylvan

'coombs,' 'all golden with the never-bloomless furze,' till their wandering habits, revolutionary sympathies, and intimacy with Thelwall attracted the notice of the Government. But the villagers had no fear of Coleridge; he was 'a whirl-brain that talks whatever comes uppermost;' the more silent Wordsworth they believed to be 'a dark traitor.'

Free from pecuniary care, and in the society of Wordsworth, Coleridge reached suddenly his poetic manhood. His best poetry belongs to this period. 'Geneviève,' 'Fears in Solitude,' 'France,' 'Lewti,' 'Frost at Midnight,' 'Kubla Khan;' the first part of 'Christabel,' the 'Ancient Mariner,' were all written before the summers of 1797 and 1798. The 'Ancient Mariner' was begun as a joint poem to pay the expenses of a walking tour. A friend's dream suggested the idea of a curse for the commission of a crime. Wordsworth, who had been reading Shelvocke's 'Voyages,' proposed that the crime should be the shooting of an albatross. He also contributed one or two single lines. As the poem grew in Coleridge's hand, they thought of writing a volume. Each was to write in his peculiar vein; but, while Wordsworth produced twenty-two pieces, Coleridge's only contribution of importance was the 'Ancient Mariner,' which commenced the volume. Cottle became the publisher, and brought out the poems anonymously, under the title of 'Lyrical Ballads.' Southey, writing to William Taylor, says: 'Coleridge's Ballad of the "Ancient Mariner" is the clumsiest attempt at German sublimity I ever saw. Many of the others are very fine, and some I shall read, on the same principle that led me through "Trissino," whenever I am afraid of writing like a child or an old nurse.' The reviewers and the public shared Southey's opinion. No one, as Wordsworth said, seemed to understand the 'Ancient Mariner.' A few copies of the ballads were sold, chiefly to sailors, who thought from the principal poem that they were a collection of sea-songs. The volume was published in the summer of 1798, and in September Coleridge with the Wordsworths sailed from Yarmouth to Hamburg.

To Coleridge's boyhood and early manhood belongs the greater part of his verse; his career as a poet practically closes in 1798. The second part of 'Christabel,' the 'Ode to Dejection,' 'Youth and Age,' 'Visionary Hope,' are the only important poems of his later life.

The Juvenile Poems are a miscellaneous collection of poetry on various subjects. Their autobiographical interest exceeds their poetic value. They chronicle not only the events of

his early life, but his mental progress. As a child he dreamed of poetic fame; at school, theology and metaphysics, subsequently politics, engrossed his interests. The three subjects are represented in the juvenile poems. As hope or despair of the old world predominates, he is alternately Pantisocrat or Revolutionist. Now his eyes are fixed on 'peaceful freedom's undivided date;' or wander 'where 'Susquehana pours his untamed stream;' now, like other fiery spirits, he hails the revolutionary creed as a divine revelation. His faith in the unity of mankind found in the Revolution a concrete form and a living voice. He exults in the gathering storm which shall sweep away distinctions of race, caste, and rank. In that morning of hope there shone before him

'A glorious world
Fresh as a banner bright, unfurled
To music suddenly.'

The most important of the Juvenile Poems, 'Religious 'Musings,' forms a curious commentary on his mind. In religion he is a Unitarian; Priestley is his 'patriot, saint, 'and sage,' yet the poem is elevated by the deep tone of religious awe, which eventually changed the current of his ideas. In philosophy he is a materialist, and a disciple of Hartley, 'wisest of mortal kind.' But, above all, politics are the inspiration of the poem. The finest passage is an apostrophe to the 'numberless children of wretchedness,' whom he bids 'rest awhile' and await their coming deliverance. He sees France quivering with the effort of the destined deliverer to burst from the cell, where sits

'The old hag, unconquerable, huge,
Creation's eyeless drudge, black Ruin.'

The sonnets glow with the same political fervour. He glorifies as champions of freedom Kosciusko, Erskine, Priestley, or attacks Pitt as the Iscariot of his country, or laments the apostasy of Burke—

'Whom stormy Pity and the cherished lure
Of Pomp, and proud precipitance of soul
Wildered with meteor fires.'

Except in metrical skill, his early poetry shows little sign of coming power. None of the Juvenile Poems rise to first-rate importance. Passages occur of vigorous invective; the vocabulary is rich and sometimes picturesque; but much is stilted rhetoric. Even the best portions are marred by extravagances and inequality. Coleridge admitted that his

early verse is disfigured by a profusion of double epithets; nor is the sentiment less effusive than the language. His artistic sense does not yet distinguish between bombast and sublimity. Striking images are ruined by ludicrous associations. He still indulges in the poetic conventionalities which Bowyer and his own matured taste alike condemned. He shouts his revolutionary enthusiasm with a noisy passion, which mistakes violence for strength, and slips into mere declamation. He strikes a note which is beyond his power of sustained expression. His voice shakes with passion, passes beyond control, and ends in a scream. The volume contains a collection of twelve sonnets. As a sonneteer Coleridge completely fails. On extreme fidelity to the Italian model different values may be attached; but Coleridge openly defies all the rules on which depend its metrical charms. The essentials of the sonnet were at this time his peculiar defects. It was to him no

‘Pastime to be bound
Within the sonnet’s scanty plot of ground.’

The frame is measured; the picture brought within it must be adequate to fill the space, complete within the limit, so finished that nothing can be spared or supplied. It need not close with a flash like an epigram, but it must not expire from inanition. Coleridge’s sonnets are deficient in subject and substance; his leading ideas are either inadequate or inappropriate; where he should be sustained he is unequal; where simple he is luxuriant; he substitutes for brevity wordiness, for self-restraint violence; instead of rising to a climax, he sinks into weakness. His sonnets display, as if seen through a microscope, the characteristic defects of his *Juvenile Poems*.

The chief promise is the skill of versification. High excellence in this art is rarely attained except by those who early show the possession of the gift. Coleridge’s delicate sense of verbal harmony was instinctive. Wordsworth calls him ‘an epicure in sound.’ But it was also elaborately cultivated. He spent days in polishing. No lyric measure, rhymed or unrhymed, was left untried. He proved the musical flexibility of our language by the experimental era in metre which he inaugurated. From Dryden to Cowper heroic couplets or blank verse predominated. So long as satire was the main region of poetry, irregular odes were regarded as little more than exercises in poetical paces. Coleridge was the first to bestow attention on metrical effect.

He weighs the tone and quantity of words in scales of gold; but his peculiar power lies in adapting movement to feeling. He seems not so much a musician as a musical instrument on which the words are played. No mere imitation of syllabic metre could produce the same result. To all but great masters metrical lawlessness is dangerous; in his hands the effect is magical. His verse has nothing of metre but the charm; it is music without the notes. Though words are less flexible than sound, and musicians necessarily surpass poets in the variety of their airs, the rival art has never produced a more perfect union of sound with sense than 'Christabel.' Some of his early poems, and especially the 'Ode to the Pixies,' give promise of this glorious gift, in the use of which Coleridge in his prime is unsurpassed.

Both in date and merit Coleridge's love poetry comes midway between his early productions and his later verse. Coleridge has neither the gaiety of Moore nor the gloom of Byron. A certain voluptuous softness was characteristic of his nature. Love was with him a matter of temperament. It is easily described, because little modified by more complex sympathies; it is poetry ready made. But in this kind of poetry Coleridge's want of self-restraint, and his naïve craving for sympathy were peculiarly dangerous. Poetry which is only the unchecked expression of dreamy tenderness approaches sickness. It is wanting in masculine vigour, and incapable of rising to grandeur.

To a little later date belong 'Kubla Khan' and 'Remorse.' Apart from the technical perfection of its fifty lines, its Oriental gorgeousness of diction, and its metrical fascination, 'Kubla Khan' is almost a unique triumph. No one but Coleridge has ever expressed the word-impressions of a dream. The feat is one which argues his special possession of poetic power. The 'Fall of Robespierre' and 'Remorse' were Coleridge's earliest dramatic poems. His splendid but unequal paraphrase of Wallenstein was written in 1799. 'Zapolya,' an imitation of the 'Winter's Tale,' appeared in 1817. 'Remorse' is well supplied with incident; but it is wanting in dramatic movement, and the action is not sufficiently developed on the stage. 'Zapolya' is altogether a weaker play. Yet one passage, where Laska's treason is revealed to Sarolta by

'That fine sense which, to the pure in heart,
By mere oppugnancy of their own goodness
Reveals the approach of evil,'

more surely than 'suspicion's hundred eyes,' suggested to Scott the scene of Alice Bridgnorth in the house of Chif-finch.

The strongest impulse of Coleridge's poetic genius continued to be politics. But the expression is now more subdued, the style more chastened; the intemperate tone of the pamphleteer appears more rarely. The noble ode to 'France' is inspired by disappointment of his hopes. It opens with a stirring appeal to all that is freest in nature to bear witness to his deep worship of 'the spirit of divinest 'liberty,' and to his hopes and fears

'When France in wrath her giant limbs upreared
And, with that oath which smote air, earth, and sea,
Stamped her strong foot, and said she would be free.'

It closes with the melancholy confession how profitless had been his pursuit of liberty in any 'form of human 'power.' His belief in humanity broke the ties of patriotism; he had cursed England as the enemy of freedom. Nor did the horrors of the Revolution check his ardour. He still looked beyond the storm-clouds to the light on the horizon. When France appeared as the enslaver of Switzerland, when the orient flush proved to be not the holy flame of liberty but the baleful star of Napoleon, his hopes were extinguished. He had looked on the Reign of Terror as if in a dream. The dream passed away, and he shuddered at the realities of his waking vision. His disappointment was embittered by the sense of confidence betrayed; his patriotism was revived by the attack on England. The shock caused a recoil in his political opinions; it also chilled his poetic impulse. The glow faded; the fire of enthusiasm—which in the absence of will and perseverance was his motive power—perished. The soul of poetry died within him, when the shrine of liberty was desecrated by its own high priests. Henceforward, so far as man was concerned, he retired within himself.

In Nature, the 'guide of homeless winds,' the 'playmate 'of the waves,' he might have found that liberty which he sought in human life. At first, in the company of Wordsworth, his mind took this direction. Such exquisite descriptive passages as those which occur in the 'Ancient Mariner' seem to show that he felt the soothing influence of Nature. From Wordsworth, too, he was learning the power of microscopic observation. To this period must have belonged the inscription for a 'Fountain on a Heath:—

‘ Long may the spring,
 Quietly as a sleeping infant’s breath,
 Send up cold water to the traveller
 With soft and even pulse ! Nor ever cease
 You tiny cone of sand its soundless dance,
 Which at the bottom, like a faery page
 As merry and no taller, dances still,
 Nor wrinkles the smooth surface of the fount.’

But from this solace he was excluded by his philosophy. Nature to him had only an apparent existence. Apart from his mind she did not exist:—

‘ We receive but what we give,
 And in our life alone does Nature live ;
 Ours is her wedding garment, ours her shroud ! ’

She was nothing to Coleridge but a self-scratched picture on the walls of his prison-house. Against so barren a view he revolted ; but the mode by which he escaped from the consequences of his philosophical theory is characteristic. Nature as she appears to us is the manifestation of the Thought of God. When we, by the exercise of our senses, create her for ourselves, our conception of her is cast in the mould of the Divine idea. Thus our senses and their impressions are identical ; the one is moulded the other presented by the Divine thought, which is within us and abroad. We look on Nature, and she reflects our own faces indeed, but God in our image. We speak to her, and she echoes back our words ; but her response is the voice of God within us. We open her pages, which our own hands have written ; but the lessons we learn are the teaching of our diviner selves. We love her, and our passion is not selfish, but a pure longing for union with the Divine thought. Thus the outward visible world of sense is the clothing of the inward, the token of the invisible, the symbol of the supersensuous. Our senses and their impressions blend in the higher feelings which they excite, and by which they were first awakened ; our conceptions and their object become fused in their common mould. As, in remote distances, earth and heaven mingle, the mountains with the sky, the clouds with the peaks on which they rest—so in our highest moods, when we contemplate Nature, wings play upon our shoulders, our souls dilate, and soar in ecstasy from the visible image to the spiritual reality, from the symbol to the thing symbolised :

‘ Oh dread and silent mount ! I gazed upon thee,
 Till thou, still present in the bodily sense,
 Didst vanish from my thought ; entranced in prayer
 I worshipped the Invisible alone.’

All creations of animated nature are

‘ But organic harps diversely framed,
That tremble into thought as o’er them sweeps,
Plastic and vast, one intellectual breeze,
At once the soul of each and God of all.’

It is the province of poetic imagination to interpret this universal language, to read this symbolism, to render to man this harmony between the worlds, to present in a single picture

‘ The one life within us and abroad
Which meets all motion, and becomes its soul.’

This theory of Nature is congenial to Coleridge’s habits of mental introversion, but it excluded him, except at rare intervals, from the outer world. His mind, no longer open to impressions from without, went to work upon itself. And self-contemplation became to him a mockery. Only when the mind is tranquil, free from the weight of care, can it soar upwards ‘enrapt, transfused . . . into the mighty ‘vision passing.’ Unless it is perfectly attuned, there cannot be ‘rhythm in all thought and joyaunce everywhere.’ A rift in the lute breaks music into discord. In the ‘wan ‘and heartless’ mood of Coleridge’s later life, when political disillusion, ill-health, domestic unhappiness, and opium had done their work, it was with a blank gaze that he regarded the beauties of Nature.

‘ I see them all so excellently fair,
I see, not feel, how beautiful they are ! ’

To Wordsworth, on the other hand, Nature was a living, breathing, thinking being, distinct from himself, the manifestation of a personal God in the outward universe. She was to him a faithful friend, a wise counsellor, from whose lips he gathered perpetual lessons of calm, in whose communings he recognised the voice that broke upon our forefathers in the garden of Paradise. Both Coleridge and Wordsworth were tried in the furnace of disappointment. Wordsworth emerged with a radiant figure at his side, not celibate but ‘wedded to the goodly universe . . . in love ‘and holy passion;’ Coleridge passed forth into the world haunted by the phantom of his former and purer self.

From the absorbing interest of the French Revolution Coleridge freed himself to write those two poems on which his poetical reputation mainly rests. In ballad minstrelsy he is unsurpassed. Not only does he impart to its simple measure an indefinable charm, but he displays powers unexpected, if not unique. The faults of his early poetry are

fatal to success in ballads; but in the 'Ancient Mariner' and 'Christabel' they are replaced by the opposite virtues. Simplicity, restraint, brevity, equality of execution are now his characteristics. In these two poems the ease and spontaneity of the ballad are combined with laconic adequacy of expression, and that 'fusing power' of the imagination, that strong, light touch, which throws its pictures on the canvas with the unlaboured, but unerring, handling of a master. Both poems sparkle with the ethereal essence of poetic life, because the supernatural world is Coleridge's peculiar province. Mysteries fascinated him; he revelled in themes which are to poetry what mysticism is to religion; in them he found full scope for the wealth of his imagination. Yet so accurate is his observance of truth and analogy that he easily produces that 'willing suspension of disbelief' which constitutes poetic faith.'

In 'Christabel' he attempts a task most difficult of execution. To realise witchery by daylight he foregoes clearness of outline. In the shadowy creation of Geraldine this indistinctness is a gain. She is a mysterious, unearthly creation, by the side of which the spirits of Scott or Byron are theatrical ghosts. But he does not altogether sacrifice definiteness. Nothing can exceed the skill with which he touches in the moral sensitiveness of Christabel, on which depends the force of the picture of Geraldine lying by the side of the 'youthful hermitess.' All the resources of rhythm and language are employed to heighten the glamour of the poem. Clear as crystal in its diction it is yet tinted like an opal with the varied hues of imagination. The romantic rhythm is so aerially musical that the notes fall as softly as snow on the sea. It is as though Coleridge had interpreted into verse the weird moanings of his *Æolian* harp, expressing in words the emotions suggested by its inarticulate sounds. The shadowy indistinctness of the whole poem intensifies the vividness of such isolated pictures as Christabel's chamber, or the serpent gaze of Geraldine, the reading of which caused Shelley to faint. Even its fragmentary character adds an element of mystery which completion would dispel. Coleridge believed that he could finish the poem; but the conclusion which he meditated, if correctly reported, would not have added to the effect. Some might wish to recall Coleridge to finish his work, as Milton longed

'To call up him who left half told
The story of Cambuscan bold.'

But the web is too finely spun to be stretched; unless it were thickened it would snap in extension. As a question of art the incompleteness increases the witchery of the poem; such visions ought to conclude with the ivory gate.

In the 'Ancient Mariner' the same creative genius is at work. The task is less difficult; the poem, consequently, is more spontaneous, and the general effect more powerful. With the simplicity of the ballad it unites those deeper shades of meaning which are the highest attributes of poetry. The remoteness of the scenes and the narrative form enable Coleridge to add a firmness of treatment incompatible with his previous presentment of the supernatural. His realistic force is not reserved for isolated pictures, but produces a lifelike impression of general truth. Together with these high excellences the dramatic power of the quiet introduction, the spell which drives the mariner to unbosom himself of his wild tale, the exquisite descriptive passages, ranging from the tropics to the polar zone, the terse simplicity and perfect finish of the language, display a range of poetic gifts rarely concentrated in so short a poem. With so perfect a composition it seems hypercritical to find fault. But it is to our minds a mistake to sink the ship in the presence of the hermit, the pilot, and the pilot's boy—there should have been no living witness to the truth of the tale but the mariner himself. Coleridge points out that ballads never moralise. On this ground he pronounces the lines in which humanity to beasts is inculcated out of keeping. 'The "Arabian Nights,"' he says, 'might have taught me better.'

It has been often noticed that poetical temperaments, after yielding to their first impulses, relapse into inactivity. The faculty awaits fresh inspiration. Milton deserted poetry for religious and political controversy. If the second crop ripens it may realise more than the promise of the first. In the case of Coleridge it never came to maturity. Even to youth the supernatural world affords no lasting impulse, and Coleridge grew prematurely old; the glow of political enthusiasm faded; no worship of Nature supplied the flame. He ceased to write poetry; the keenness of his critical sense checked his productiveness. He saw in the imaginings of his mind when reduced to shape the same difference that others find between castles in the air and earthly habitations. He might have been the Wordsworth of man; no one was more eminently gifted to help his fellows to realise the world within themselves. His mind was ever brooding over its

own problems, his poetry abounds in those reflections which have occurred to thousands and yet leave the impress of originality: he was essentially a poet who tells what others feel. But here, at this crisis in his career, the 'Ancient Mariner' becomes a prophetic allegory of the poet's future. He analysed and theorised upon his feelings till his poetic power was dimmed. Metaphysics made matters worse; ill health, disappointment, and, above all, opium, debased his mental vigour. The young aspiring student, eager to commune with superior beings, revolving the mysteries of Plotinus and Paracelsus, became, like Faust, the slave of sensual pleasure. His own hand slew the shaping spirit of his imagination; the curse was on him for his fatal weakness; he did penance for his fault. The 'Ode to Dejection,' the finest of all his odes, is an elegy on his poetic gift. The same pathetic note of regret for a wasted life is struck in 'Youth and Age.' To all his poetical plans, now in 'Ariosto's Moon,' his epic poem on the fall of Jerusalem, 'schemed at twenty-five;' his 'Michael Scott,' conceived on the same lines as Faust; his many uncompleted fragments, must be applied the sentence he himself wrote on 'Kubla Khan'—*αὐριον ἄδιον ἄσω*: but the morrow is yet to come.' The complacent egotism, the innocent self-importance, so humorously displayed in early youth, deserted him; the 'divine and mighty whispering voice' which from childhood to maturer years

'Spake to me of predestinated wreaths
Bright with no fading colours,'

was silenced at thirty. In their place was the feeling which rose to his mind as he listened to Wordsworth's 'Orphic Song'—

'Ah! as I listened with a heart forlorn,
The pulses of my being beat anew;
And even as life returns upon the drowned,
Life's joy rekindling roused a throng of pains—
Keen pangs of love, awakening as a babe
Turbulent, with an outcry in the heart;
And fears self-willed, that spurned the eye of hope;
And hope that scarce would know itself from fear;
Sense of past youth and manhood come in vain,
And genius given, and knowledge won in vain;
And all which I had culled in wood-walks wild,
And all which patient toil had reared, and all
Commune with thee had opened out—but flowers
Strewed on my corse, and borne upon my bier,
In the same coffin, for the self-same grave!'

With Coleridge's visit to Germany commences the second period of his life. In September 1798, Wordsworth and his sister and Coleridge landed at Hamburg. Coleridge made his way to Ratzeburg, and in January 1799 to Göttingen. There he attended lectures on physiology, natural history, and anatomy, learnt to speak the language fluently, collected materials for a history of German literature, and especially for a life of Lessing. In July he returned to England. It was now that he formed his friendship with Sir Humphry Davy, at this time assistant at the Pneumatic Institution in Bristol. After a tour with the Wordsworths through the English Lakes he came to London in November. In six weeks he translated 'Wallenstein.' For the next few months he undertook the political and literary department of the 'Morning Post,' and so highly were his services valued that he might have become a partner. Daniel Stuart, the editor and proprietor, preferred him, as he said, 'to write the leading paragraph of a newspaper to Mackintosh, Burke, or any man I ever heard of.' 'Could Coleridge and I,' he wrote, 'place ourselves thirty years back, and he be so far a man of business as to write three or four hours a day, there is nothing I would not give for his assistance.' But Coleridge could not endure the drudgery of journalism. He preferred, as he told Stuart, 'the country and the lazy reading of folios to 'two thousand times two thousand pounds.'

In July 1800 he left London, wound up his affairs at Nether Stowey, and moved to Greta Hall near Keswick. The house stood on a peninsula made by the River Greta; behind it rose Skiddaw; before it and to either side was pitched 'a giant's camp of tent-like mountains.' Wordsworth was settled at Grasmere. Such a home should have stirred his poetic gifts. But he felt, as he wrote to Josiah Wedgwood, 'a total incapacity to associate any but the 'most languid feelings with the godlike objects' which surrounded him. His time was mainly occupied in plans. During the next sixteen years he completed little or nothing. This decay of his powers resulted from the collapse of his health. He suffered from maladies to which the October night by the River Otter and the New River escapade gave him a constitutional tendency. While at Bristol he was subject to rheumatism; the climate of the Lakes aggravated his complaint. It was now that his habit of taking opium was confirmed if not acquired. Writing in April 1826, he says that he began the practice as a relief for pain, in ignorance of the fatal character of the Kendal Black Drop.

Not till he neared the maelstrom and was powerless to stem the current did he realise its power. Undoubtedly he first resorted to opium to relieve pain. But it is difficult to believe that he only began the practice at Keswick. In November 1796 he complains of a neuralgic attack, a Cerberus which he 'sopped with between sixty and seventy 'drops of laudanum.' The dream of 'Kubla Khan,' composed under the influence of an anodyne, closely resembles one of De Quincey's opium dreams. Professor Benecke of Göttingen said that in 1799 Coleridge took opium. In a letter to Wedgwood dated January 1800, Coleridge speaks of the 'pleasurable operations of a dose of opium.'

His restlessness grew upon him. He was unable to stay in one place or fix his attention on one subject. He collected stores of materials, sketched great plans, projected a 'National 'Review' of which he was to be editor, and a history of British literature, bibliographical, biographical, and literary. He was continually coming and going between Grasmere and Keswick. Besides planning foreign expeditions he stayed with Wedgwood in Wales and in Dorsetshire, with Southey at Bristol, with Poole at Stowey. In 1803 he started with the Wordsworths for Scotland. Rogers met them making their tour 'in a vehicle that looked very like a cart.' In September he was back at Keswick. Nerveless, incapable of continuous exertion, miserable about trifles, he determined to try a warmer climate. In April 1804 he sailed for Malta, where he acted as Secretary to Governor Ball. Cut off from his friends, without congenial society, wearied by mechanical work, deriving no benefit from the climate, he became during these months at Malta the confirmed slave of opium. In September 1805 he left Malta for Rome. Of his visit he has left no record. On his voyage home the American ship in which he was sailing was chased by a French cruiser, and he was compelled to throw all his papers overboard. But, except as pictures of Roman society, his notes would have had little value. Architecture did not interest him. Some years before he passed through York with Cottle. Cottle went to see the cathedral, and Coleridge in search of him came to the door, described his friend to the verger, and went away without looking inside the building.

His movements after his return to England in August 1806 are difficult to trace. He found himself, as he describes his return to Wedgwood, 'again in my native country, ill, penniless, and worse than homeless.' Keswick was still his

nominal home, but his absences grew more and more frequent. In 1807 he and his wife were staying at Bristol, at Nether Stowey, and at Bridgwater. At the latter place, De Quincey, who recognised him by the peculiar appearance of 'haze or dreaminess' which mixed with the light of his eyes, made his acquaintance. His gift of 300*l.*, anonymously conveyed to Coleridge, should, as Mr. Traill observes, 'cover 'a multitude of subsequent sins.' In the winter of 1807-8 Coleridge, through Davy's influence, delivered lectures on the fine arts, poetry, and the English poets before the Royal Institution in London. On the whole the lectures proved unsuccessful. Sometimes Coleridge did not appear; 'audience 'after audience' were dismissed on pleas of illness. Those lectures which De Quincey heard were given 'without heart 'or power of originality,' 'with an entire absence of his own 'peculiar and majestic intellect.' The appearance of the lecturer was in the highest degree painful. 'His lips were 'baked with feverish heat, and often black in colour, and, in 'spite of the water which he continued drinking through 'the whole course of the lecture, he often seemed to labour 'under an almost paralytic inability to raise the upper jaw 'from the lower.' His suffering and failure would excite only sympathy, if both were not indirectly produced by that 'accursed drug.' The lectures on Shakespeare were substantially the same as those which Coleridge delivered in 1811. Schlegel's lectures were given orally in 1808. It may be taken as proved that Coleridge could not have borrowed his Shakspearean criticism from his German rival.

Early in 1809 he was living with the Wordsworths at Allan Bank. There he insisted on having his daughter Sara with him. Like Byron's Ada, Sara was 'sole daughter 'of his house and heart.' It was his vehement desire to make himself the first object of her affections. Under the Wordsworths' roof he began the publication of the 'Friend.' Sarah Hutchinson, Mrs. Wordsworth's sister, wrote nearly the whole of it at his dictation. The fate of the 'Friend' resembled that of the 'Watchman.' The subscribers fell away rapidly; it lingered on for six months, and in March 1810 came to an end. In the same month he left the Lakes for ever. His estrangement from his wife was now complete. On Mrs. Coleridge's side the change was sufficiently natural. Her husband was the slave of opium, the wreck of his former self, 'rolling,' as he said to Cottle, 'rudderless.' Mrs. Coleridge, who received the whole of her husband's annuity from the Wedgwoods, never saw him again. Lamb

truly said Coleridge 'ought not to have wife or children; he 'should have a diocesan care of the world, no parish 'duty.'

After leaving the Lakes, Coleridge stayed first with the Montagus in London, then at Hammersmith with the Morgans. The Morgans tried hard to break him of his habits; but his ordinary consumption of opium had now risen to an extremely large amount, to which, according to Southey, was added a considerable quantity of spirits. During this period he continued to write and lecture. From September 1811 till April 1812 he constantly contributed to the 'Courier.' In November 1811 he delivered lectures on Shakespeare and Milton for the London Philosophical Society. Among his audience were Byron, Lamb, Rogers, as well as Payne Collier and Crabbe Robinson. Two years later he gave another course at Bristol. He had not been there since 1807. Then Cottle found him full of activity, 'about,' as he hoped, 'to realise the expectations 'of his friends.' In 1813 his face was sallow, his eye wild, his hand and step tottering. The cause of his condition was no longer a secret. Cottle, as his oldest friend, expostulated with him. Coleridge in answer discloses his dreary history. He wishes to place himself in a private madhouse, and concludes, 'You bid me rouse myself; go, bid a man paralytic 'in both arms to rub them briskly together, and that will 'cure him. "Alas!" he would reply, "that I cannot move 'my arms is my complaint and misery.'" His sense of his degradation was keen. 'Conceive,' he writes, 'a spirit in 'hell employed in tracing out for others the road to that 'heaven from which his crimes exclude him. In short, conceive whatever is most wretched, helpless, hopeless, and 'you will form a notion of my state.' The sums which he spent in opium were large. Meanwhile he left his wife and children to be mainly supported by friends, and his son Hartley was sent to college on alms collected by Southey. He 'never,' wrote Southey in 1814, 'writes to his wife or 'children, or opens a letter from them;' he did not even answer the letter in which Southey told him of the scheme for Hartley's education. He might have made money by his pen, but he preferred to accept the charity of a Cottle. The one bright spot in his career is the success of 'Osorio,' which was acted in 1813 at Drury Lane under the title of 'Remorse.' At Byron's suggestion he wrote 'Zapolya' in 1815; but the play was rejected. By Byron also he was introduced to Mr. Murray, who in 1816 published 'Christa-

'bel.' The depth of degradation to which Coleridge had now sunk renders the effort by which he recovered himself more remarkable. In 1816 he left Calne, came to London, and consulted Dr. Adams. On Adams's introduction Mr. Gillman received Coleridge into his house at Highgate. In April 1816 Coleridge arrived, with the proofs of 'Christabel' in his hand, and remained there till his death in 1834. Gillman's evidence that he entirely abandoned opium is more reliable than De Quincey's insinuation to the contrary.

During his miserable life from 1800 to 1816 Coleridge's mind was chiefly occupied with journalism, criticism, and religious philosophy. Though the 'Biographia Literaria' was not published till 1817, it was composed within this period. Before passing on to those topics which engrossed his later life, his position as a journalist, politician, and critic may be briefly considered.

Coleridge was a born journalist. In his study he lost himself and his point; with the printer's devil at his elbow his style became vigorous, direct, and incisive. A portion of his journalistic work has been collected in the 'Essays on 'his Own Times.' Mr. Traill's observations on this side of Coleridge's literary career are admirable.

'Nothing,' he says, 'is more remarkable in Coleridge's contributions to the "Morning Post" than their thoroughly workmanlike character from the journalistic point of view, their avoidance of "viewiness," their strict adherence to the one or two simple points which he is endeavouring, at any particular juncture in politics, to enforce upon his readers, and the steadiness with which he keeps his own and his readers' attention fixed on the special political necessities of the hour. His articles, in short, belong to that valuable class to which, while it gives pleasure to the cultivated reader, the most commonplace and Philistine man of business cannot refuse the, to him, supreme praise of being eminently "practical."'

Coleridge's political views after his return from Germany were somewhat anomalous. His enthusiasm for the French Revolution was displaced by a deepening dread of Napoleon. But he opposed the war, and assailed the ministry for rejecting the French overtures in 1800. 'Fire, Famine, and Slaughter' is a bitter attack on the policy which Pitt impersonated. On the renewal of the war, Coleridge supported it as a struggle for liberty. The peace party seemed to him, not anti-ministerial, but anti-national. The patriotism of the 'Friend' is in curious contrast with the cosmopolitan theories of his republican fever. But though the excitement of the struggle with Napoleon attracted Coleridge to

practical politics, his true interests remained in general principles. In theory he passed over from the republicanism of his youth to the philosophical conservatism of his later years. His passion for penetrating to the heart of questions ruled his attitude towards politics. He brought to bear on historical or contemporary topics the methods of scientific inquiry. Before his day, history, studied not for the explanation of facts but for the facts themselves, possessed only a biographical or antiquarian interest. Coleridge, like Lessing or Herder, recognised that the succession of historical events was capable of scientific treatment. He regarded history as a progressive unfolding of the capabilities of man, and claimed for its facts a meaning and a place in the evolution of humanity. In his desire to test every organism of society he remained a Liberal; but there was nothing subversive in a criticism which endeavoured to justify the permanence of institutions by bringing to light the principles they embodied. His mind revolted from the unimaginative utilitarianism of modern reformers. In politics, himself an idealist, he believed that laws underlay every form of the social organisation. The existence of an institution or the prevalence of an opinion raised the presumption that they satisfied some want or represented some experience of the human mind; they had an aim and a meaning. The good for which they existed must be discovered before their obsolescence or utility could be determined. Without regard to principles no reform should be attempted. Ruling ideas might be deduced from history; to realise them in abstract perfection was impossible, but they should be the standard of legislative change. The rough-and-ready school of modern politics regarded nothing but practical anomalies, advocated remedies worse than the disease, destroyed eternal verities to cure casual disorders. Coleridge preached the value of the transcendental side of politics to an eminently practical generation. But his work was not valueless. He cherished institutions and hereditary beliefs surrounded with new lines of defence, and dignified contests which often appear petty squabbles about the adjustment of temporary means to ephemeral ends.

'Church and State' was not published till 1830. But the positions assumed by Coleridge in his most matured political essay may conveniently be stated here. His view is characterised by his usual independence. None of the recognised theories on this important but wearying subject are exactly represented. Speaking broadly, Church and State

were then regarded either as the same body under different aspects, or as two independent powers in alliance. Each theory admits various modifications, but with none of them does Coleridge wholly agree. With Hooker he held that the visible Church of Christ included all professing Christians, but denied that Church and State are one body in different aspects. Distinguishing, with Warburton, Church from State, he repudiated his theory of a convention between the two societies. His own theory is an application to constitutional law of his characteristic principles. Religion stands to law in the same relation which it bears to morality and philosophy. As it is their basis, so it inspires law; it is the positive, the guiding element, as law is the negative, restraining element. Religion and law, Church and State, are not separate but distinct; they are harmonious not hostile, neither to be confounded nor opposed. He distinguishes the Church in England from the Church of England, the localised Church of Christ from the National Church by law established. Independent of civil government, having officers appointed for special duties of religion, is the universal Church of Christ, a theocratic institution, a spiritual society divinely incorporated, exercising that general spiritual authority, without which Christianity is 'vanity and dissolution.' It is opposed not to particular States but to the world; it belongs to no realm or kingdom; it asks from States neither wages nor dignities. Every nation provides separate machinery for the performance of the external duties of government and for the moral cultivation of the people. England entrusts these latter duties to the officers of the Christian Church, and allots to them for these services a portion of the national land. Thus the National Church is established by the State as the trustee of a national fund on fixed terms. As public servants the national clergy receive revenues, and are amenable to State laws. But the union of two functions in the same persons does not make them any the less members of the Universal Church; they do not merge their position as Churchmen in their citizenship; in each capacity their claims, duties, and obligations are distinct. On these principles Coleridge condemned Laud's ecclesiastical policy, because, as he thought, the archbishop limited the Church of Christ to the hierarchy. He denied that Dissenters could, by voluntary secession, exonerate themselves from the obligation of supporting the National Church. He admitted that bishops of the Church of Christ have no vocation to interfere in legislation, while

he asserted their sacred duty as national prelates to take part in national councils. He opposed the emancipation of the Catholics, because their allegiance to a foreign power disqualified them from the proper education of citizens. When the Irish Church was attacked, he raised the cry of 'the Church in danger,' not because of peril to her endowments, but as a breach of the idea of the Universal Church, and a step towards the recognition of Romanism as the Church in Ireland. However much he disliked the Tractarian deference to the authority of the early Fathers, he warmly sympathised with the revival of the idea of the Church as a co-ordinate and living power by right of Christ's institution and promise.

In criticism, Coleridge's sympathetic and penetrating imagination enabled him to do incalculable service. He did for England the work of Goethe and Lessing in Germany. In his hands criticism proposed higher aims; it deserted the schools of Bossu or of Johnson, and ceased to discuss only the appropriateness of language. It no longer busied itself exclusively with the external dress of verse, but inquired into the soul and essence of poetry itself. The famous controversy whether Pope was a poet was part of the movement which Coleridge headed. His critical power is most conspicuous in the marginal notes on the pages of favourite books, scattered hints which are often more suggestive than laboured treatises, the chapters on Wordsworth in the '*Biographia Literaria*,' and the notes of his lectures on Shakespeare.

His analysis of Wordsworth's poetry is a masterpiece of criticism. The '*Lyrical Ballads*' were written by Wordsworth and Coleridge to illustrate their poetical creed. Both agreed that neither direct imitation nor artificial decoration of feature is the true dress of poetry. At once idealists and realists, they rejected the unemotional coldness of a slavish copy as well as the tawdry fripperies of secondhand images. Realism was the stronghold of Wordsworth, idealism of Coleridge. Wordsworth elicited unexpected treasures from familiar appearances; Coleridge deduced those emotions which would be aroused if his supernatural events were true. Thus the two poets painted two different worlds, the one outside the range of daily experience, the other neglected because of its familiarity. Coleridge showed that poetry was no fairy-land separated from us by an impassable abyss, no cloud picture in the remote distance, but a creation of the imagination rendered with so realistic a semblance of

truth as to procure that 'willing suspension of disbelief' which constitutes poetic faith.' Wordsworth, who dealt with the trivial aspects of everyday life, removed from the eye the scales of custom, sanctified the common world, unveiled its secret shrines of beauty, read its hidden significance. As has been seen, Coleridge's dilatoriness and Wordsworth's industry disturbed the balance of the scheme. From later editions of the 'Lyrical Ballads,' Coleridge's contributions disappeared; Wordsworth added more poems and the celebrated preface, in which he defended on its merits one side only of his original opinions. Coleridge, convinced of Wordsworth's genius, recognised his unlikeness to great poets of former ages. Assured that his friend's work was not rhymed prose but a new creation, he set himself to vindicate his own opinions against contemporary criticism. Other critics judged Wordsworth's original and irregular works of art by mechanical rules applicable only to existing models. But Coleridge, so far as he went, raised criticism to the rank of a science. Descending to the eternal well-springs of poetry, he framed canons which were living not mechanical, fundamental not superficial, rules by which may be tested the uncertain estimates of individual taste. At the same time he preserves his impartial attitude. He points out with unerring touch the defects of Wordsworth's theories, and the faults of his practice; without defending him when he persists in crawling on all fours, he selects, with most discriminating insight, those priceless passages which approach the ideal perfection of true poetry.

In these chapters on Wordsworth, Coleridge distinguishes imagination from fancy. His explanation is closely connected with his philosophy and theology. The whole discussion assumes that poetic inspiration proceeds from a higher source than experience; it is a protest against belief in evolution from beneath. Imagination is a flash of divine light laying bare the secrets of Nature; those are the truest poets who are quickest to detect her unvarying meaning. Imagination is insight into the integrity of the universe, united with that 'fusing power' which combines in one view the material and spiritual world, and gives a wholeness to fragmentary life. The world of sense is the garment of the spiritual world, the manifestation of spiritual realities. Behind the transitory images which our senses report is veiled the changeless, true existence. True poetry, in Coleridge's view, deals only with nature so far as her creations reveal their hidden source. Imagination lives in the spheres

of sense and spirit, and exercises a twofold function. On the one hand, it reads to itself the symbolic voice of nature; on the other, it interprets, through fancy, the perceived meaning as faithfully as human language permits. The understanding cannot adequately conceive these highest truths; its conceptions are but approximations. Fancy, therefore, becomes the handmaid of imagination, employed to create images, metaphors, and figures, through which imagination seeks to convey her teaching. The creations of fancy are substitutes for the truth, not, like symbols, the truth itself in a lower form; they express, not the same subject with a difference, but a different subject with a resemblance. Thus, the essence of poetry is truth in its purest, highest form. The use of conventional diction, stock metaphors, or arbitrary ornaments is absolutely unprofitable. It lays waste the true province of imagination as an interpreter of hidden mysteries; it robs fancy of her dignity by petrifying her animating energy; it substitutes form for matter, dress for soul; it fixes attention, not on the truth which is revealed, but the fiction under which it is conveyed.

In his lectures on Shakespeare, Coleridge came even more openly into conflict with prevailing criticism and academic fastidiousness. Critics of the French school, educated on Hellenic models, worshipped purity of form. The range of subjects was limited. Literary etiquette required that by every artifice of language poetry should be distinguished from prose, that the sacred unities should be hallowed. Shakespeare had thrown these *bien-séances* to the winds. He was admired, if admired at all, in spite of his artistic solecisms, as 'a child of nature, who knew no better than to 'write as he had written.' But Coleridge maintained that Shakespeare's form was perfectly adapted to his substance; that his genius was never lawless; that, if he deviates from the accidents of Greek drama, he strictly adheres to the essentials of his art. Coleridge's mind always rises from details to principles. Consequently, he excels most in generalities. As a verbal critic he is peculiarly unfortunate. His remarks on individuals are often mistaken refinements; but his elucidation of the character of Hamlet is masterly. He had a touch, he said, of Hamlet himself; and, as he developed the moral of the play, he seemed to his hearers to be pronouncing an elegy or a satire on his own character. 'Action is the great end of all; no intellect, however grand, 'is valuable if it draw us from action and lead us to think

‘till the time of action is passed by and we can do nothing.’ His lectures were often paradoxical or obscure, marred by repetitions, interrupted by digressions, dealing with every topic except the subject announced. But at their best they were rich in pregnant and suggestive thought, teeming with ‘magnifiques aperçus littéraires.’ It could not have been otherwise. His mind was at once poetical and philosophical, his sympathy no less keen than his insight; his originality remained proof against ‘the spoils of all times,’ with which his reading had enriched him; his sensibility, though drilled to correctness, lost nothing of its natural quickness; his analytical power became, by continual exercise, instinctive. Such a union of varied gifts, both natural and acquired, made Coleridge one of the greatest critics that England has yet produced.

Coleridge’s life at Highgate, from 1816 to 1834, includes the last, the most uneventful, but the most prolific of the three periods of his career. In 1816 appeared ‘Christabel,’ and the ‘First Lay Sermon or the Statesman’s Manual.’ In the following year were published the ‘Biographia Literaria,’ ‘Sibylline Leaves,’ ‘Zapolya,’ and the ‘Second Lay Sermon.’ In 1818 he issued a remodelled edition of the ‘Friend.’ In 1825 he brought out ‘Aids to Reflection,’ and in 1830 his essay on ‘Church and State.’ The ‘Confessions of an Inquiring Spirit’ were not published till after his death. During the whole period he was collecting materials for the ‘magnum opus’ which was to reconcile religion and science. The most successful course of lectures which he ever delivered was given in 1818 at Flower de Luce Court; in 1825 he read his essay on the ‘Prometheus of Æschylus’ before the Royal Society of Literature. For his lectures he was well paid; but his pecuniary troubles were revived in 1820 by the failure of his publishers. He found himself, as he told Allsop, obliged to ‘abrogate the name of philosopher and poet, and scribble as fast as I can, and with as little thought as I can, for “Blackwood’s Magazine,” or, as I have been employed for the last days, in writing manuscript sermons for lazy clergymen, who stipulate that the composition must be more than respectable.’ In these embarrassments Coleridge proposed that his friends should raise an annuity for him that he might devote himself exclusively to literature. He states that considerable sums were already promised. The negotiations seem to have been interrupted, possibly by a flicker of self-respect in Coleridge himself, possibly by his selection as a Royal Associate of the

Society of Literature. In the company of his children he found a new pleasure. His two sons were with him in 1820. At the close of that year he visited Oxford to appeal to the Provost of Oriel to reconsider his decision to deprive Hartley of his Fellowship. Later on, his daughter Sara, whose first book he had read with pride, visited him. In her train came Henry Nelson Coleridge, whom she eventually married. In 1828 he made a tour on the Rhine with the Wordsworths. Five years afterwards he received an ovation at Cambridge, where he had gone to join the meeting of the British Association. With these exceptions he was rarely absent from Gillman's house at Highgate.

During this closing period of his life theology and metaphysics were his absorbing interest. They were his first as well as his last passion. From childhood he was exercised with the problem 'What can we know?' and he strove, by analysis of the relations of the thinking subject with the object of thought, to reconcile the answers of science and religion. At Cambridge his politics influenced his religious opinions. Republicanism joined hands with Unitarianism, and under the influence of Friend, a tutor of his college, Coleridge became a Unitarian, or as he preferred to call himself a 'Psilanthropist.' Together with the religious and political tenets of his party he adopted their materialism. Priestley was a disciple of David Hartley, a former Fellow of Jesus College, Cambridge. Hartley's views were far in advance of contemporary science. He connected intellectual with physical processes, traced all mental operations to changes in cerebral matter, explained complex mental phenomena by the law of association. Coleridge became an enthusiastic follower. He called his son David Hartley, preached his master's doctrines, apostrophised him as

'Of mortal kind

Wisest: the first who marked the ideal tribes

Up the fine fibres to the sentient brain.'

In 1794-5 Coleridge was a republican in politics, a Unitarian in religion, in philosophy a materialist, in morals a Necessitarian.

For a few years politics, pantisocracy, marriage, poetry, distracted his attention. Then the shock of the course taken by the French Revolution roused him to the conviction that the pursuit of liberty was a 'profitless endeavour.' Metaphysics resumed their sway over his mind. Vainly friends warned him of his danger. In 1797, Mrs. Barbauld

in strangely prophetic lines denounced to him the grove of metaphysics where 'shadows seem realities,' and 'things of life fade to the hues of shadows,' where 'dubious shapes'

'Lure the eager foot
Of youthful ardour to eternal chase;
Dreams hang on every leaf; unearthly forms
Glide through the gloom; and mystic visions swim
Before the cheated sense:'

where Indolence

'Fixes her turf-built seat, and wears the garb
Of deep Philosophy, and museful sits
In dreamy twilight of the vacant mind.'

She urged him to active exertion—

'Youth beloved
Of Science, of the muse beloved, not here,
Not in the maze of metaphysic lore,
Build thou thy place of resting! Lightly tread
The dangerous ground, on noble aims intent,
And be this Circe of the studious cell
Enjoyed, but still subservient.'

In spite of warning, his appetite for metaphysics became an insatiable craving. Five years later, in often quoted lines, he describes how—

'By abstruse search to steal
From my own nature all the natural man;
This was my sole resource, my only plan,
Till that which suits a part infects the whole,
And now is almost grown the habit of my soul.'

The course of political events loosened him from his Unitarian moorings. He was swept into the stream of eighteenth century philosophy. 'I found myself,' he writes, 'all afloat. Doubts rushed in upon me, broke upon me from the fountains of the great deep, fell from the windows of heaven.' In the schools of Hartley, Locke, Leibnitz, and Berkeley, he found no Ararat. He was forced into the 'cul de sac' of Hume. But in such a solitude as that in which are written essays on suicide he could not rest. He felt with Pascal 'le silence éternel de ces espaces infinis m'effraie.' Though haunted by an ever-recurring scepticism, his faith in God wavered only for a brief interval. He drifted towards Spinoza, whom he discussed with Wordsworth among the Quantock Hills. He shrank from the application of personal pronouns to the Deity, and felt it more in harmony with his

indefinite sensations to 'worship nature in the hill and 'valley.' But the 'unica substantia' of Spinoza did not long remain his resting-place. He was, to use Sterling's expression, eminently theopathic. A striking feature in his early poetry is the reverential awe with which he approaches the Deity. His search for a basis on which to found his belief in a personal God drove him from Pantheism, as it had in the first instance directed him to Descartes. From the sensationalists he was repelled by his firm conviction of the essential distinction between men and brutes, persons and things, natural and spiritual action. He felt that the human mind contained some element not decomposable in their analysis. Thus, Unitarian though Coleridge still was, his religious instincts saved him from unbelief or Pantheism.

His mind set in a new direction. From a mechanical religion enforced by external evidences, from a morality based on utility, from a philosophy founded on experience, he turned towards the mystics. At Christ's Hospital he had pored over Plotinus and Iamblichus; he now studied Tauler, Boehmen, and Law. Like the mystics he was prone to lose himself in inward contemplation; like them he rebelled against frigid formalism. Their fearless simplicity carried him back to the childhood of speculation. Mysticism, as experience shows, flourishes in times of change. It is the romance of religion. With its chivalrous daring and grim tragedies of the soul, it appealed strongly to his poetic nature. His mind, at once contemplative and ardent, resembled that of a mystic. While he craved to pierce the barrier between man and the unseen world, he longed for an inaccessible rest. Pantisocracy was but another fastness of perpetual calm, a second Eden or Avalon remote from tumult. His debt to the mystics is warmly acknowledged. Their writings, he said—

'helped to keep alive the heart within the head, gave me an indistinct, yet stirring, presentiment that all the products of the reflective faculty partook of death, and were as the rattling twigs and sprays in winter, into which a sap was as yet to be propelled from some root to which I had not yet penetrated, if they were to afford my soul food or shelter. If they (the mystics) were a moving cloud of smoke to me by day, yet were they a pillar of fire throughout the night, during my wanderings through the wilderness of doubt, and enabled me to skirt, without crossing, the sandy deserts of unbelief.'

Coleridge was thus prepared to revolt from the sensationalist school. The supposed consequences of Locke's

philosophy had been pushed to the extreme which provokes reaction. The mind was treated as a 'tabula rasa' on which the senses wrote. Knowledge was entirely derived from experience; man, denied a moral sense, became a mere machine; the assassin and his dagger were equally objects of esteem or horror. Against such extravagances the idealists rebelled. Speaking broadly, the sensationalists denied, the idealists affirmed, the existence of elements of thought distinct from sense experiences or their modifications; states of consciousness which the former claimed as products of sensation, the latter claimed as original; the former explained all notions contained in the mind as generalisations from observed experiences, the latter recognised ideas created by the mind itself. Coleridge had himself come to the conclusion that the internal mechanism of the mind actively co-operates in conception. He believed that the principles invoked to explain mental activity are really results of its operation, that association begets its own laws, that experience itself is the product of the mind's inherent forces. Necessary truths could not be derived from experience. Observation might frame the law of causation, it could not explain the necessity of thinking a cause for every effect. Time and space are finite as we know them, yet inseparable from our ideas of either is infinity: 'Sur les mondes détruits le Temps dort immobile.' Brutes, if sensationalists were right, possess the same raw material of thought as men, but their use of their faculties differs not in degree but in kind. On all sides he caught glimpses of a light from above. No science of history was possible unless there was a Divine purpose in the evolution of the world. The prophetic attitude of the Jewish people could only be explained by their glimpse of the power which rules the future. To the craving of mankind for higher guidance than the gathered fruits of external sensation, he attributed the power of abstract theories over revolutionary movements. On the communion of the poet with his Maker depends the truth of his analysis of poetic power. His explanation of Shakespeare's magic assumes a mastery of the secrets of creation which no accumulation of experience could bestow. Equally in his view must all ideas of supersensuous things, all moral and spiritual judgements be independent of sense evolution. No external sensations can create ideas of God, virtue, the soul, or explain the categorical imperative of the moral law. On these and similar grounds Coleridge rebelled against the sensationalist school; he refused to believe that

the operations of the mind had been scientifically analysed, or could be rendered intelligible without admitting their testimony to an antecedent consciousness grander than our own.

In 1798 Coleridge left England for Germany. Shortly afterwards Kant took possession of him 'with a giant's hand.' When he returned from Malta he had ceased to be a Unitarian. His thoughts had received a Biblical colouring, and now rested on the basis of Christian theology. In Rome he bought a copy of the Jesuit Zola's edition of 'Bull on the Nicene Creed,' a work which helped him to accept the doctrine of the Trinity. To estimate Coleridge's debt to Kant would be difficult. He nowhere puts himself forward as his expositor; and he drew largely from Schelling and Jacobi as well as from the sage of Königsberg. His gratitude is expressed in general terms; particular obligations are not directly acknowledged. But it is easy to see the direction in which lay Kant's peculiar fascination. Coleridge made little use of the destructive criticism by which Kant struck down much of the false metaphysics of the day, or of the speculative reason. It was by the constructive portion that he was attracted. Irresistibly impressed by the existence of the moral law, which forces men to judge unconditionally between good and evil, a law not generalised from experience, but transcending its range, an absolute standard of duty universally acknowledged though partially obeyed, Kant concluded that man lives in and has faculties appropriate to the two spheres of nature and of spirit, of uniformity and of will, of necessity and of freedom. The avenue through which the moral law is revealed to man, the faculty by which spiritual truths are apprehended, is the Practical Reason. On this assertion of the diverse elements and distinct faculties in man Coleridge seized with the tenacity of despair. If certainty is unattainable, if nothing can be affirmed about anything, man is a mere phantom among phantoms. If his highest instincts were baseless illusions, if he was indeed the slave of sense-experiences, God and the world were but flickering shadows cast on the high walls and narrow courtyard of his prison-house. As a Unitarian he had denied the doctrine of Original Sin and of the Atonement. He had rejected them not because they were incomprehensible, but because they had seemed to his understanding absurd. He now learned from Kant to confine the Understanding to its proper sphere, to distinguish the counterfeit from the reality, the human superstructure

from the divine foundation. Imperfect solutions of fundamental facts, which made believers sceptics, resulted from similar attempts of the human understanding to explain mysteries to which its faculties were wholly inappropriate.

Coleridge, like Bacon, held that knowledge of current speculative opinions affords the sole ground for political prophecy. He appealed to history to prove that all epoch-making revolutions coincided with the rise or fall of metaphysical systems. Of the interdependence of metaphysics, philosophy, morality, and theology, he was firmly convinced. The truth according to religion cannot be opposed to the truth according to science; religion might be above, it could not be adverse to philosophy. What is considered incapable of conception as possible will inevitably be deemed incapable of being revealed as real. Men will not continue to believe as theologians what they deny as men of science. But the framers of the Church Liturgy, Homily, and Articles entertained views on metaphysics diametrically opposed to those which predominated in the nineteenth century. Orthodox philosophy, in Coleridge's day, destroyed spiritual religion. The mind was denied access to the supersensuous; the will was subjected to physical laws; mysteries were discredited; moral obligation was treated as a misleading phrase. Yet theologians still fought under the banner of Locke. Assailants and defenders of Christianity snatched weapons from the same armoury. Christian apologists caught the philosophical tone, rejected authority, joined in the appeal to evidences, based belief on its reasonableness, confined religion to practical piety. They threw aside the Catholic theology of their childhood to fight in armour which they had not proved. Hume dashed their new weapons from their hands. In the place of spiritual devotion, inward faith, the enthusiasm of a creed, stood a mechanical religion 'too proud to worship and too wise to feel,' defended with the listlessness of a lost cause. So long as theologians admitted the senses to be the only inlet of knowledge, they were only striving to keep back the oceanic tide of scepticism with mops and pails. To collect all ancillary and subordinate sciences, to unite them all in theology, the science of sciences, to revive spiritual religion, ally it with a spiritual philosophy, re-establish its metaphysical basis, was Coleridge's object. He insisted on a belief in spiritual influences which orthodoxy denounced as fanatical Methodism; he referred 'the mind to its own consciousness 'for truths indispensable to its happiness;' he taught men

that no difficulties of the mere understanding can invalidate their highest instincts; he challenged the competency of the tribunal before which Hume summoned theologians. Kant strengthened his faith in unseen realities, and in the possession of spiritual faculties. But Kant was then regarded as a second Swedenborg; and Coleridge, like his ally, was branded as a mystic. It was for the distinction of the Reason from the Understanding that he contended during the last thirty years of his life, enforcing it in a thousand ways, illustrating it with all the stores of his learning and fancy, insisting upon it as the '*Gradus ad Philosophiam*,' 'casting,' as he said, 'my bread upon the waters with a perseverance which, 'in the existing state of the public taste, nothing but the 'deepest conviction of its importance could have inspired.' It is unjust to calculate the influence of this teaching from the 'spiritual philosophy' in which Green endeavoured to expound his principles. No fair attempt to estimate its extent can overlook the fact that all his teaching, whether it is critical, or religious, or philosophical, or poetical, or historical, or political, converges more or less directly upon the same point.

The main object of Coleridge's metaphysics was to bring out the transcendental side of man's being, to found on a new analysis of his faculties a reconciliation between science and revelation. In his view Understanding and Reason are modes of operation by which truth is discovered; but their methods are no less different than their province. The understanding is the faculty by which we reflect and generalise. It classifies phenomena, reduces them to rules, and thus constitutes the possibility of experience. These functions are discharged according to the *à priori* forms which constitute its distinct nature. Like Kant, Coleridge held there is something conceived which was not perceived, that the adage, '*Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*,' is only true with Leibnitz's qualification, '*præter intellectum ipsum*.' The proper province of the understanding is all practical knowledge, the adaptation of means to ends, of measures to circumstances in the whole business of life. Its sphere is restricted to possible experience; its characteristic is clearness not depth; its forms are only adapted to the material world. The present century is its golden age. Yet even in its apotheosis it remains an adaptive faculty; beyond proximate ends its powers cannot pass. In politics it eschews principles, and for the wisdom of statesmen substitutes the shifts of embarrassed

spendthrifts. The eye is not more inappropriate to sound than is the understanding to the modes of spiritual existence. If it explains fundamental truths, it substitutes counterfeits for reality. If it proves the existence of God, it ends in atheism; if it speculates on virtue, it finds utility; on the end and meaning of man it is ominously silent; it leaves the purport of existence an insoluble enigma.

If man possessed only understanding, there would be no difference, except in degree, between his prudence and the less fallible cunning of the fox. But man possesses also Reason. Coleridge uses the word with some ambiguity; but he never employs it for the reasoning faculty. It is not the syllogistic process, but an intuition, the vision of the Hebrew prophets. To speak of human understanding is not pleonastic, for instinct is the understanding of brutes; but to speak of human reason is waste of words, since reason is distinctive of humanity. Reason and understanding act in different ways. From a multitude of particular instances understanding generalises rules of experience, to which no higher certainty belongs than the absence of known exceptions. Reason supersedes the experimental process; it acts intuitively, affirming truths which cannot be conceived otherwise, which no sense could perceive, no experiment verify, no experience confirm.

According to its application, Reason is either speculative or practical. Speculative Reason affirms or denies the notices of the senses; it is the ground of formal principles, the organ of science. Practical Reason is reason applied to supersensuous objects. It comprehends will, conscience, moral being. It is the spiritual opposed to the carnal mind. It is Bacon's 'lumen siccum,' or lucific vision. It is not merely a passive sense, it is also an active, controlling power. It is the faculty of intuitive insight into spiritual life, the avenue through which the moral law is revealed, the link which binds man to the higher order. It is the source of absolute ideas, the fountain of actual truths. These absolute truths are the marks of its celestial origin; they are truths of reason, and constitute reason itself. God is the object of reason, but is Himself reason: He is the supreme reason, whence the soul 'reason receives, and reason is her 'being:' absolute truth exists only as known by the reason, and reason knows only as being itself absolute truth. In reason and the sphere of its operation the thinking subject and the object are identified; knowledge becomes one with being. Reason is not an individual faculty bestowed on

some, withheld from others; it is not a mysterious power wielded by the wise alone; but it is a divine nature of which all partake, and its influence is greatest among the simple and unlearned. It is a ray of the divinity, a projected disk from the Sun of Righteousness, an echo of the Eternal Word, the presence of the Holy Spirit.

In his treatment of Reason, Coleridge has gone far beyond Kant. By it he seeks to explain those mysterious intimations of primal truths which form 'the master light of all 'our being.' In his hands it is coloured by the New Testament; it also partakes of the splendid Platonic fiction of the soul, the intuition of Neo-Platonists, Bruno's identification of mind with matter, the 'intellectuelle Anschauung' of Schelling. But he strongly maintained that the distinction between the understanding and the practical reason was no new discovery. The serpent is the Egyptian symbol of the understanding, tempting man to evil by counterfeit good. The original fall of man, as Coleridge suggests, consisted in obeying the understanding instead of the universal reason. The story of Prometheus tells how this heavenly spark was superadded to man by a God before Zeus, the binder of free spirits under the fetters of passive mobility. To St. Paul and St. John the distinction is ever present. All the great divines of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries insist upon it; it is the groundwork on which is built the superstructure of the Church; it appears in the poetry of Shakespeare and Milton, the writings of Hooker, South, Leighton, Taylor, and the philosophy of Bacon.

On the recognition of this distinction he founds his theory that the philosophical methods of Bacon and of Plato are 'radically one and the same.' In disgust at the verbal legerdemain of schoolmen, Bacon undervalued Plato. But Coleridge maintains that Plato argues 'not only from, but 'in and by induction of facts,' that Bacon demands as the guide of research the 'prudens quæstio' which is 'dimidium 'scientiæ,' that both attacked the arrogance which leads man to measure God by his own reflective faculty. The cogency of induction in fact depends on a uniting element derived from the human mind, not from experience. Without an impression of probable results induction is unproductive. An antediluvian patriarch might spend his life in collecting promiscuous particulars without result, while from single instances, observed with a preconceived aim, laws were often revealed. Thus both Plato and Bacon demanded the mental initiative; both required a tentative theory. Bacon inter-

prets, Plato anticipates nature. Bacon's experiments proposed are Plato's ideas; ideas are prophetic laws, as laws are tested ideas. Both recognised the need of the forethoughtful query which is the prior half of the knowledge sought; both agreed that this element was contributed, to use Bacon's phrase, by the '*lux intellectus*,' the pure impersonal reason, free from the various idols before which human understanding is prostrate.

As Coleridge's metaphysics were a recoil from the dominant sensationalism, so in morality he preached a crusade against fashionable ethics. Paley's school reduced virtue to expediency, made utility the object, and self-interest the guide, of action, treated virtue and vice as lazy synonyms of prudence and miscalculation. Coleridge, on the other hand, contended that enlightened self-interest is not virtue, nor duty regard to personal consequences; but that moral goodness is more than prudence, and religion higher than morality. The distinction between reason and understanding underlies his argument. But as he does not distinguish religion from morality, no systematic treatise is to be expected. His one object is to vindicate the spiritual side of man, and his responsibility to higher laws than those of nature. The ideal of prudence is '*l'amour de moi-même, mais bien calculé*,' of morality a pure life on pure principles. Though prudence implies self-sacrifice, it is essentially selfish. Its dictates and those of morality may correspond, but on different grounds. Prudence is the animal instinct, appealing to the senses and understanding, ignoring motives, regarding only results. Morality appeals to the heart and the conscience; it distinguishes good from evil unconditionally; it commands not only our duty but our reverence. Few men can by their own strength live under the iron rule of duty, or warm the cold purity of the moral law into a vital principle. The dynamic force of morality lies, according to Coleridge, in reason, religion, and will; in reason, the representative of divine reason, the source through which the moral law is revealed; in religion which contracts universal rules into universal duties; in the will which coerces our conduct. The three powers are legislative, executive, and ministerial. The highest life is that of a man whose will is subjugated to the universal will, so that he wills the things of God. Of this harmony conscience is the witness.

Coleridge strenuously asserts man's freedom of will. His whole theory of morality assumes that man is free. If he

originates nothing, does not determine his own states of being, has no spontaneous energy, if his characteristic is uniformity not power, necessity not freedom,—then personality and moral responsibility are extinguished, sin and remorse become misleading phrases. Though fresh interest has been imparted to Coleridge's views by Bishop Temple's Bampton Lectures, it is not our purpose to enter on this scientific battle-ground; it suffices to say that Coleridge took the view which most commends itself to Christian philosophers. He did not identify man with nature, or emphasise their points of contrast; he rather narrowed the gap between the moral and physical spheres. He recognised in man that natural element which is good in itself but becomes evil if it overpowers his moral being. His whole tone of thought led him to regard man and nature as manifestations of God, but man as the highest revelation. He looked to science to reconcile the apparent dualism, to display the real unity, to discover in nature the God who is revealed in man. Meanwhile, his eye traversed the wide region of the unknown and inexplicable with the calm confidence of faith. History taught him the lesson of human progress, the development of his latent powers. Reason, transcending the limits of conception but not of thought, offered an earnest of his future capacity, a foretaste of the enlargement of his intellectual faculties, which time was ripening to maturity. He believed the full-grown man would solve the riddle of the infant.

Coleridge's theology was based on that of the great divines of the Tudor and Stuart periods. Hooker, Field, Donne, Taylor, Andrewes, Bull, Jackson, Smith, Cudworth, More, were among his favourite authors. In eighteenth century theologians he found no satisfaction. 'Next to the inspired Scriptures, yea, and as the vibration of that once-struck hour remaining on the air,' stood, in his estimation, Leighton's commentary on St. Peter. Equally with Leighton he valued Luther, as the man whose grasp on spiritual truths was firmest, and whose writings contained the 'very marrow of divinity;' he could not 'separate his name from that of St. Paul.' He respected St. Augustine, but despised the rest of the Fathers, with one or two exceptions, as credulous and ignorant. Luther, Melancthon, and Calvin he considered to be 'worth a whole brigade of the Cyprians, Firmilians, and the like.' In the great controversies of the Reformation era he leaned rather to the Arminians than the Calvinists; but he protested equally against the gloomy

tyranny of the latter, which crushed the joyous freedom of life, and the apologies for Christianity offered by the former, 'pleadings fitter for an Old Bailey thieves' counsellor than 'for Christian divines.' He held the Bible to be the best of books, but a book after all. His posthumous letters on inspiration were highly valued by Arnold as 'well fitted to 'break ground in the approaches to that momentous subject.' The mechanical theology which he combated was the counterpart of sensational metaphysics and utilitarian ethics. He admitted that the existence of God is incapable of scientific proof; but he held the notion of God to be 'essential to the human mind,' and doubt only so far short of impossibility as to leave His existence a truth of religion and subject of commandment. In vindicating the reality of spiritual influences he is careful to guard against extravagances. The presence of this power can only be inferred from the results of its working; it cannot be the object of man's senses, nor can its promptings supersede the ordinances of Christianity. His subjective tone of mind and his recoil from the ordinary arguments used by contemporary theologians, led him to underrate the value of external evidence. But it was a true instinct which prompted him to insist that the best proofs of Christianity were the doctrines themselves and their correspondence with the deepest wants of human nature.

His religious speculations have a twofold interest. Like those of all poets, they are characterised by their individuality; but, as the record of his own victorious struggle with degrading vice, they have a higher significance. It is impossible not to feel the autobiographic nature of the proof which he offers—in the 'Aids to Reflection'—of the divinity of Christ. To those who were drifting, as he had drifted, into the shoreless sea of doubt, he cries that he has found safe anchorage. He addresses those inquirers who, like himself, found no home in the furnished lodging of tradition. In controversy he presents a rare combination of earnestness with unsectarian spirit, yet his toleration was not another name for indifference or a euphemism for indolence; it was a tolerance rather of men than of principles. 'Tolerate,' he says, 'no belief that you judge false, and arraign no 'believer. The man is more and other than his belief; God 'alone knows how small or large a part of him the belief 'in question may be for good or evil.' He himself was not a dogmatic theologian; his perception of his internal self was so vivid that it loosened his hold on external truths.

In his power of engrafting them on his own nature lay his true strength. He possessed the three qualities on which Pascal insists: 'il faut avoir ces trois qualités; Pyrrhonien, géomètre, Chrétien soumis; et elles s'accordent et se tempèrent en doutant où il faut, en assurant où il faut, en se soumettant où il faut.' He repeatedly insists on the necessity of men making truth their own. 'Never,' he says, 'be afraid to doubt, if only you have the disposition to believe.' He attacks that belief which is fixed 'like a limpet to the rock by mere force of adherence,' and which substitutes a stubborn clutch for calm assurance. Yet when mysteries of religion are concerned he in substance echoes the words of St. Augustine, 'Sic accipite ut mereamini intelligere. Fides enim debet præcedere intellectum, ut sit intellectus fidei præmium.' He has been charged with making reason the test of revelation. In the ordinary sense of the word reason, nothing is further from the truth. In every variety of form he insists that the logical faculty cannot be the measure of faith. Reason meant to him the power of apprehending spiritual truths which the understanding is impotent to comprehend and language powerless clearly to express. 'Omnia exeunt in mysterium;' the absolute ground of all things is a mystery. Coleridge accepted the 'modus' of the Trinity and the Incarnation as inscrutable facts. Yet he does say that reason and right faith cannot be opposed. The test is negative only. Man may and must reject any explanation of divine mysteries which imputes injustice to God. The strongest proof of the truths of revelation lies in their harmony with conscience; and no interpretations of Scripture, no speculative objections, however plausible, no articles of faith, can be true which contravene those absolute notions of right and wrong implanted by God Himself.

These subjects were the chief topics of Coleridge's monologues. He propagated his views in society till his conversation assumed something of the importance which oral teaching possessed before the invention of printing. No difficulty checked the utterance by word of mouth of his subtlest fancies. It became the fashion to attend the gatherings at Highgate. He was surrounded by votaries. Some came, like Irving, to gather hints for sermons; others, like Sterling or Maurice, to piece together the links in the promised philosophy. Some went from curiosity, others to listen to those 'piercing radiances of a most subtle insight,' which even Carlyle recognised in his talk. Coleridge had mingled too rarely in active life to be a conversationist.

His mind was not arranged with cut-and-dried specimens of talent, not did he in society readily exhibit his resources. Always a mannerist, he had little dramatic power; his voice, though musical, lacked variety of modulation, and often degenerated into sing-song. Not only did he wear 'a clerical-looking dress,' but his manner was that of the pulpit; Charles Lamb had never heard him 'do anything but preach.' His monologues were reveries, often clouded with mystic magnificence. He talked himself clear, and inflicted the process on his hearers. The least concise of reasoners he was also, in De Quincey's opinion, the most severely logical. Southey admits his 'passion for close, hard thinking.' But his thoughts ranged over so wide a field, he revolved in such vast circles, and overflowed with such a flood of illustration, that to many his expositions seemed 'an aimless, cloud-capt, cloud-bound, lawlessly meandering discourse.' His hearers lost him, and thought he had lost himself. The mist, from which emerged the 'balmy, sunny islets of the blest and intelligible,' may have existed in the mind of Carlyle. When 'like some great river—the Orellana or the St. Lawrence—that, having been checked and fretted by rocks or thwarting islands, recovers its volume of waters and its mighty music,' he 'swept into a continuous strain of eloquent dissertation,' his hearers agreed that his conversation was, as an intellectual exhibition, altogether matchless. The heavy face brightened, the indefinable mouth grew firm, the irregular features became all eagerness, the grey eye gleamed 'like the glittering eye of the Mariner.' 'His thoughts,' as Hazlitt described him, 'did not seem to come with labour and effort, but as if borne on the gusts of genius, and as if the wings of his imagination lifted him from his feet.' The recollection of his talk haunted Dibdin. 'It drove away slumber, or if I relapsed into sleep there was Coleridge—his snuff-box and his kerchief—before my eyes.' Living in seclusion among great men of former ages, he often misjudged his contemporaries; but he was never overbearing, nor indulged in the 'bow-wow' of Johnson. He quarrelled with no one; no private jealousies intruded into his talk. The perfume is vanished and the colour faded from his words; it is impossible now to estimate their influence when they were fresh gathered in their fullest bloom, still sparkling with the dews of his brilliant imagination.

On the other hand, Coleridge never understood conversation, and was often unintelligible. Dibdin's friend was not

the only 'irritated hearer' who thought 'fair play a jewel.' 'Pourtant pour M. Coleridge,' said Madame de Staël, 'il est tout-à-fait un monologue.' Wordsworth and Rogers listened to his talk for two hours, and agreed, not only that they had never heard anything like it, but that neither had understood a syllable. This obscurity was due partly to the subjects which he chose, partly to the jargon which he used. His favourite topic was the Kantian theory of the mind. Lord Hatherley 'heard the whole of the poet-philosopher's 'system of Polarities, the Prothesis, the Thesis, the Mesothesis, and Antithesis, showered down on a young lady of 'seventeen, with as much unction as he afterwards expounded 'it to Edward Irving.' Carlyle's famous sketch of Coleridge is set in an exquisite framework. No more perfect example of word-painting exists in prose than his description of the view from Highgate Hill. But the accuracy of the human portrait may be fairly doubted. The painter was an atrabilious jealous man. The personal private character of Coleridge's talk was peculiarly calculated to irritate Carlyle. Not only was the bitter Scotchman antagonistic to Coleridge in mind and temper, but he had special reasons for sneering. A rival talker, he listened 'for two stricken hours' to Coleridge's 'theosophico-metaphysical monotony.' If he expected a short answer to a terse question, Coleridge would accumulate 'formidable apparatus for setting out,' and approach the subject as circuitously as possible. Carlyle suspected him of claiming, as Schelling claimed, an exclusive faculty of spiritual perception; he believed that his influence on Sterling was disastrous; he wrote Sterling's life as an answer to Hare, who was a disciple of Coleridge. Even where no special cause appears for ill-feeling, estimates of contemporaries from Carlyle's pen must necessarily be distrusted. But, in his portrait of Coleridge, Carlyle has gratified not only his sarcastic spleen but his private dislike. Yet, if Coleridge's philosophy was an empty bubble, he saw in it that rainbow which Carlyle refused to see in anything. Both grappled with perplexing problems of life: Carlyle, vanquished by the inscrutable riddle, sank into morbid despondency, Coleridge never lost faith in humanity. Reduced to practice, Coleridge's philosophy succeeded while Carlyle's failed; at the close of their days the light on Coleridge's face is the expanding glow of sunrise, that on the face of Carlyle is the fading flush of sunset.

For the last three years of his life Coleridge rarely left his room. On Sunday, July 20, 1834, Henry Coleridge saw

him for the last time. Green, his literary executor and the closest friend of his later life, was with him to the end. He died on Friday, July 25, 1834. Weeks after his death, Charles Lamb's face would suddenly grow grave and abstracted, and he would exclaim, half interrogatively, as though his mind could not yet grasp the fact, 'Coleridge is 'dead.'

Over the whole field of thought Coleridge exercised a stimulating influence. His reputation was built partly on capacity, partly on performance. His plans exceeded his achievements, yet the amount of his completed work was very considerable. His contributions to journalism were of first-rate importance; to criticism he gave new impulse and direction; he wrote poetry which in its peculiar charm remains unsurpassed; in philosophy he stemmed the tide of sensationalism; in religion he opened up new paths of spiritual access. It is in these last two directions that his influence has been most discussed. If intuitionist philosophy is necessarily unfounded, if in 'the holy jungle of transcendental metaphysics' he contracted, as Heine said of Schelling, *liaisons* with abstract Hamadryads which proved wholly unproductive, it is indisputable that in England he led a movement which for a time triumphed over the school of Locke and Hume. If his poetic faculty tempted him to avoid exactness as unpicturesque, to exchange dogmatic definiteness for a vague spiritual voluptuousness, it was undoubtedly a deep insight into human needs which prompted him to vindicate the spiritual side of man's being, and to found belief on the self-evidencing authority of a spiritual creed. If he adopted enthusiasm in the place of the results of dialectics, and failed himself to harmonise the religious and the scientific views of human nature, he was the first to recognise the danger of their divorce and to attempt their reconciliation.

In the performance of the homeliest duties of life Coleridge fell below the ordinary standard. He deserted his wife and neglected his children; he drugged himself with opium; he accepted and solicited alms from his friends. His failure to achieve literary success embittered his life, but the fault was in a great measure his own. Procrastination, irresolution, lack of independence, marred his usefulness. Never trained in that thinking which begets an act and a consequence, he thought for thinking's sake. The pleasures of musing intercepted the springs of action; in intellectual exercise he forgot practical exertion. With a

struggle he might have increased the value as well as the amount of his writings; but it cost him less effort to accumulate materials than to reduce them to form, to pile up words than to give succinct expression to his ideas, or to sift explanations from digressions. 'I never,' said Sir Walter Scott, 'knew a man of genius that could be regular in all his habits; but I have known many a blockhead who could.' The apology fails to help Coleridge. It was not his genius that mastered him, but his weakness. He did not neglect little things for great, but great things for little; he wasted his powers in sauntering and talking. But these defects formed only one side of the man. Unstable as a child, he was yet the 'heaven-eyed creature' whose genius is sublime. Though he sank to depths of moral degradation, he also rose to heights of inspiration. Desultory in habits, fitful in purpose, he could yet be so indefatigable in labour that he produced work which is the very quintessence of artistic finish. He had not sufficient manliness to reject dependence; but, when his will was enfeebled by habit and disease, he triumphantly freed himself from his debasing slavery. Though from one point of view his figure is pathetic, if not contemptible, from the other it is one of the most impressive that can be seen among English writers of genius. In his 'Table Talk' appears a passage called 'An Admonition,' which might be entitled his *apologia pro vita sua*. 'There are,' he says, 'two sides to every question.' Some critics may prefer to 'dwell on the foolish, perplexing, imprudent, dangerous, and even immoral, conduct of 'promise-breach in small things, of want of punctuality, of 'procrastination in all its shapes and disguises.' But others will 'take him in his whole—his head, his heart, his wishes, 'his innocence of all selfish crime—and a hundred years 'hence, what will be the result? The good—were it but a 'single volume that made truth more visible, and goodness 'more lovely, and pleasure at once more akin to virtue, and, 'self-doubled, more pleasurable! and the evil—while he 'lived, it injured none but himself; and where is it now? in 'his grave. Follow it not thither.'

- ART. II.—1. *M. Pasteur. Histoire d'un Savant par un Ignorant.* Par VALÉRY RADOT. Paris: 1884.
2. *Louis Pasteur, his Life and Labours.* By his Son-in-Law. Translated from the French by Lady CLAUD HAMILTON. London: 1885.
3. *Micro-Organisms and Disease.* An Introduction into the Study of Specific Micro-Organisms. By E. KLEIN, M.D., F.R.S., Joint Lecturer on General Anatomy and Physiology to the Medical School of St. Bartholomew's Hospital. London: 1884.

IN the French group of objects contributed to the International Health Exhibition at South Kensington last year, there was a separate compartment labelled, in prominent letters, 'Pasteur's Laboratory,' and described in the catalogue as 'apparatus and instruments used in the pathogenic and prophylactic investigations of epidemic affections.' To the casual observer this laboratory appeared to be mainly made up of an extensive collection of glass tubes, plugged at the mouth with cotton wool, and of glass bulbs, with long sinuous necks, both half-filled with pellucid or turbid liquids, which were inferentially to be looked upon as the finished pathogenic and prophylactic products, elaborated in the neatly arranged apparatus, and which were of harmless aspect enough, although perhaps not very readily suggestive of purpose to every glance that fell upon them. In two of the little volumes which are named at the head of the following article, some further light, however, is thrown upon the uses to which the pathogenic apparatus is put, and, under that illumination, we must frankly say that the Executive Commission appear to us to have exercised a wise discretion in showing the apparatus without a special demonstration of its employment, if they wished it to stand anywhere by the side of the electrically illuminated fountains in general attractiveness. In the '*Histoire d'un Savant par un Ignorant*,' translated by Lady Claud Hamilton, for the service of English readers, under the well-conceived title of '*Louis Pasteur, his Life and Labours*,' a picture of this laboratory is drawn, as it occasionally appears when in commission and practical service, under the direction of the distinguished pathologist now so well known to fame. The passage to which we allude is to the following effect:—

'Even now the experiments are in full swing. Biting dogs and bitten dogs fill the laboratory. Without reckoning the hundreds of

mad dogs that have died in the laboratory during the last three years, there never occurs a case of hydrophobia in Paris of which Pasteur is not informed. Not long ago a veterinary surgeon telegraphed to him, "Attack at its height in poodle-dog and bull-dog. Come." Pasteur invited me to accompany him, and we started, carrying six rabbits with us in a basket. The two dogs were rabid to the last degree. The bull-dog especially, an enormous creature, howled and foamed in its cage. A bar of iron was held out to him; he threw himself upon it, and there was great difficulty in drawing it away from his bloody fangs. One of the rabbits was then brought near to the cage, and its drooping ear was allowed to pass through the bars. But, notwithstanding this provocation, the dog flung himself down at the bottom of his cage and refused to bite.

'Two youths then threw a cord with a slip loop over the dog as a lasso is thrown. The animal was caught and drawn to the edge of the cage. There they managed to get hold of him and secure his jaws, and the dog, suffocating with fury, his eyes bloodshot, and his body convulsed with a violent spasm, was extended upon a table and held motionless, while Pasteur, leaning over his foaming head, at the distance of a finger's breadth, sucked up into a narrow tube some drops of saliva. In the basement of the veterinary surgeon's house, witnessing this formidable *tête-à-tête*, I thought Pasteur grander than I had ever thought him before.'

The drops of the mad dog's saliva thus sucked up into the tube by Louis Pasteur's mouth were no doubt 'cultivated' in cotton-wool-plugged glass tubes, exactly resembling those which were exhibited in the west central gallery at South Kensington. But what is the harvest that is expected to be gathered from so strange a form of cultivation? It is our purpose, in the following review of the '*Life and Labours of Pasteur*,' to furnish an answer to this question.

M. Valéry Radot, the 'Ignorant' who aspires to write the history of the 'Savant' in the first-named book, is the son-in-law of Pasteur, and the history is a very remarkable narrative of the doings of a still more remarkable man. In the introduction which Professor Tyndall has furnished to Lady Claud Hamilton's translation of the book, the Professor, alluding to the original work, very truly and pertinently says:—

'It is the record of a life of extraordinary scientific ardour and success, the picture of a mind on which facts fall like germs upon a nutritive soil, and, like germs so favoured, undergo rapid increase and multiplication. One hardly knows which to admire most, the intuitive vision which discerns in advance the new issues to which existing data point, or the skill in device, the adaptation of means to ends, whereby the intuition is brought to the test and ordeal of experiment.'

Louis Pasteur, the object of this exordium, and the hero

of the history, was born at Dôle in 1822, and was the son of an old soldier, who had been decorated upon the battlefields of France. When Louis was three years of age, the old soldier changed his residence from Dôle to Arbois, and busied himself with the work of a tan-yard; and the son, as soon as he was old enough to benefit by the teaching, was entered as a scholar at the communal college of the place. The growing lad, however, soon manifested at Arbois a genius for scientific pursuits, which drew from the principal of the college there the prophetic remark that the young scholar was not destined for a chair at the small college over which he himself presided, but must fix his aspiring gaze upon 'the great *École Normale*.' In consequence of there being no Professor of Philosophy at Arbois, Pasteur was removed to Besançon, and there received the degree of '*bachelier-ès-lettres*,' and was immediately afterwards appointed tutor of the college. Whilst holding this tutorship, he prepared himself for the examination of the *École Normale*, and in due time passed in this examination as fourteenth, and in the subsequent examination of 1843 as fourth, on the list.

Pasteur studied chemistry simultaneously under the teaching of Dumas at the Sorbonne and of Balard at the *École Normale*, and soon became a very able experimentalist. In the course of his labours in chemistry, he was very strongly attracted to investigations relating to molecular physics, and entered upon some subtle inquiries as to the molecular conditions of crystals. He was nominated early in his career to the Professorship of Physics in the *Lycée* of Tournon, but he declined to avail himself of the opening which this nomination offered, in order that he might continue his work at the *École Normale*, in the accustomed association with M. Balard.

Whilst pursuing his chemical studies, Pasteur remarked that the salts containing tartaric and paratartaric acids—compounds apparently identical in chemical constitution—differed from each other in assuming symmetrical and unsymmetrical forms, and in their mode of influencing polarised light passing through them; and he inferred that this difference in reality indicated a difference of internal molecular arrangement. He thought, also, that the symmetrical and unsymmetrical * states were characteristic of inorganic bodies, and of organised structures built up under vital agencies. The more immediate importance of his subsequent work

* Technically distinguished as '*dissymmetrical*.'

alone forbids these earlier investigations and speculations, which have considerable interest in themselves, from being here more particularly dwelt upon. It was whilst his attention was occupied by these matters, that Pasteur received the appointment of Professor of Chemistry at Strasburg. Very shortly afterwards, the critical period occurred in his scientific career. At the age of thirty-two years he was made Dean of the Faculty of Sciences at Lille, a town standing in a Department of which one of the principal industries is the manufacture of alcohol from beetroot. The new dean was at once, and very naturally, impressed with a desire to improve the process pursued in this branch of industry, and applied himself very assiduously for that purpose to the study of fermentation. He was aware that the change was one which all organised matter was prone to undergo spontaneously after death, without the intervention of the hand of man. Gay Lussac and Liebig had already taught that the transformation was essentially the work of a ferment, and that the ferments were in every case albuminoid substances in a state of internal molecular commotion brought about by the chemical agency of air, the oxygen of which was held to be the first cause of the breaking up of the complex and unstable molecules. The molecular transformations were looked upon as gradually communicated from particle to particle in the interior of the fermentable matter, until it was resolved into new products. Berzelius and Mitscherlich had more recently invented a so-called 'catalytic' explanation of the process, attributing the transformation to the influence of contact, in which the ferment acted by its mere presence, without adding anything to, or taking anything away from, the fermentable matter when it impressed it with its own unstable impulses. Pasteur, however, was by no means satisfied with either of these explanations. He thought that Liebig was assuredly wrong in his idea that it is the dead portion of yeast which acts upon the sugar in saccharine fermentation. He examined carefully the change which occurs spontaneously in the fermentation of milk, and which transforms some part of the saccharine ingredient into the product known as lactic acid. He observed that in this process a living organism of microscopic dimensions was invariably present, which bore the distinctive and well-individualised form of a diminutive rod-shaped body, nipped up in the middle, which multiplied spontaneously by splitting itself transversely across, and which, by the frequent repetition of growing and splitting, produced genera-

tion after generation of similar bodies. This minute living organism had been concealed from the earlier observers in consequence of the abundance of decomposing organic substance with which it was ordinarily mixed up. Pasteur, to free himself from this cause of obscurity, conceived the happy thought of preparing a pure solution of sugar mingled with a small trace of chalk, and of then placing a droplet of fermenting milk in the liquid, after it had been made perfectly pellucid by filtering. On the following day, the previously clear and limpid liquid had become turbid, and the turbidity was found, when microscopically examined, to be due to an abundant crop of the germinating rods. From this memorable experiment Pasteur proceeded to the conception of his theory of fermentation, which is based upon the idea that the ferment is properly a living organism, and that the process is primarily and essentially a phenomenon of nutrition. The ferment increases in weight during its period of activity, and it does this by feeding upon the sugar, and by building it up with, for the most part, the addition of very minute quantities of some kind of mineral matter, into the substance of its own organisation. But the constituents, which are drawn from the sugar to accomplish this object, leave the remaining parts free to recombine themselves as a residual product, which, in the case of fermenting milk, becomes alcohol and lactic acid, and in the other still more familiar forms of saccharine fermentation, alcohol and acetic acid.

Pasteur made the first authoritative statement of his views concerning the Germ-Theory of Fermentation in a memoir which was communicated to the Academy of Sciences in 1857. Liebig fought gallantly against the new hypothesis, and in support of his own opinions, insisting that the presence of a decomposing albuminoid substance was indispensable to the fermentative process. Pasteur met this by a crucial experiment, which may be here adduced as an altogether typical illustration of his own method of controversy. He prepared, with very great care, a solution which had no albuminoid substance of any kind in it, and demonstrated that in this the conversion of sugar of milk into lactic acid was effected with the utmost facility. The liquid which he used for this demonstration consisted of a pure solution of sugar mingled only with a small quantity of a crystalline salt of ammonia, combined with phosphate of potash and magnesia. He sowed, so to speak, in this artificially prepared food, a minute speck of the living rod-cells of the

lactic acid ferment, and those cells at once multiplied, and fresh stores of lactic acid were copiously generated. The phosphorus, potassium, and magnesium of the mineral salts were combined with the ingredients drawn from the sugar of milk, and in the end were converted into lactic acid. A similar experiment was afterwards made with the yeast of beer, and the yeast-cells germinated, and alcohol was produced. The yeast-cell, although a specifically distinct organism, is of precisely the same general character as the rod-cells of the ferment of lactic acid. Its individual form, that spoken of as the torula,* was, indeed, known to the Dutch naturalist, Leeuwenhoek, and to Cagniard-Latour. Both these observers had noticed that yeast was composed of small cells, had seen these budding and multiplying, and had even suspected that the fermentation of sugar might in some indefinite way be associated with the growth and reproduction of the cells. M. Dumas, the well-known chemist, had also conceived that the budding of the yeast-globules was calculated to furnish some clue to the nature of fermentation. It was reserved, however, for Pasteur to prove that the question was one of much larger application and of much deeper importance than any of these early observers had imagined.

When either beer or wine is made, the sweet wort, or the must of the grape-juice, as it may be, is placed in wooden vats or barrels to undergo the fermentation. Whether the principle of the ferment be spontaneously present in or upon the grapes, or be added designedly in the form of yeast, the essential part of the fermentation—that is the multiplication of the living germs of the ferment and its augmentation in bulk and weight, proceeds entirely without any influence from the operation of free oxygen gas. In large breweries, for instance, the fermenting vats are of enormous size and capacity, and in these heavy carbonic acid gas is generated, which rests upon the surface of the liquid in a thick layer to the entire exclusion of the air. In the thus isolated sweet wort, the life of the cells of the ferment, and the production of the constituents of its ever-increasing substance, nevertheless go on with extraordinary activity, and altogether without the instrumentality of *free* oxygen. The result is a propagation and continuance of life without air. But an important result ensues from this condition of the

* A fungoid organism more recently designated 'saccharomyces.' The organism of the lactic acid ferment is known as the *bacterium lactis*.

process, as all brewers and wine-growers are aware. The alcoholic product of the fermentation brought about by the living ferment is in such circumstances enormously increased. A single pound of the ferment is competent to produce the alcoholic transformation of from seventy to one hundred and fifty pounds of sugar, although with the same allowance of ferment and with fermentation carried on in shallow vessels with free access of air, not more than five or six pounds of sugar can be decomposed.* The following comprehensive law is thus established. The more free oxygen the ferment consumes, the less is its transforming or fermentative power; and the more perfectly the life of the ferment is carried on without the external presence of free oxygen, the greater is its power of transforming sugar. Pasteur's attention was soon fixed upon this distinction, and he was afterwards led by close study of all the facts connected with this circumstance to infer that life without air and fermentation are naturally co-ordinated incidents in the economy of nature. M. Valery Radot records that Dumas one day said to Pasteur, at a meeting of the Academy of Sciences, in reference to this generalisation:—

‘You have discovered a third kingdom—the kingdom to which those organisms belong—which, with all the prerogatives of animal life, do not require air for their existence, and which find the heat that is necessary for them in the chemical decompositions which they set up around them.’

It was through these investigations that Pasteur was led to the recognition of two distinct forms of microscopic life, one of which he termed that of the ‘aérobies,’ or living cell-formations that require for their operations the presence of air; and that of the ‘anaérobies,’ or living cell-formations that live, work, and multiply in the absence of air. Bacteria and moulds which germinate only in the presence of air, and which act by setting up a true slow combustion, are instances of the aérobic class. The vibrios and their analogues are anaérobic, and live and work without air; but they can live in this absence of air only so long as they are liberally rationed with their appropriate food. So soon as this fails

* As a matter of fact, the living ferment-cells *must* have oxygen. But when they can get no supply of it from the air, they take it from the sugar, decomposing the sugar-molecules to possess themselves of it, and converting them into alcohol, which is chemically *sugar deprived of some of its oxygen*. The production of the alcohol is due to the forced withdrawal of oxygen from the sugar.

them they perish from the want of new matter to decompose, and then form, on their own account, a mass of lifeless organic matter, which in its turn is preyed upon by their *aérobic confrères*. Both classes of these organisms conspire to accomplish the great work of keeping up the balance of nature, by giving back to life the material that is essential to its own reproduction. Pasteur, in some very subtle experiments, found that organic matters, enclosed in vessels from which all living microscopic germs had been excluded, continued to present free oxygen for apparently unlimited periods of time; but that in closed vessels, where living germs had been allowed to remain, oxygen was totally absent, and carbonic acid present in its place. In this way Pasteur has succeeded in demonstrating that the so-called energetic decomposer oxygen is weak as an agent of decomposition when the microscopic organisms are absent, but of irresistible power and energy when they are present. M. Bouillaud, an aged physiologist, once querulously asked Pasteur, in a meeting of the Académie de Médecine at Paris, 'But let M. Pasteur then tell us what are the ferments of the ferments?' Pasteur's ready answer to the interrogative remark was, 'The ferments of the ferments are simply *ferments*.' Pasteur's own view of this interesting subject is succinctly and clearly stated in the following passage, taken from Lady Claud Hamilton's translation of M. Valéry Radot's book:—

'Thus, in the destruction of that which has lived, all reduces itself to the simultaneous action of these three great natural phenomena—fermentation, putrefaction, and slow combustion. A living organism dies animal or plant, or the remains of one or the other. It is exposed to the contact of the air. To the life which has quitted it succeeds life under other forms. In the superficial parts which the air can reach, the germs of the infinitely small *aérobies* hatch and multiply themselves. The carbon, the hydrogen, and the nitrogen of the organic matters are transformed by the oxygen of the air, and under the influence of the life of these *aérobies*, into carbonic acid, vapour of water, and ammonia gas. As long as organic matter and air are present, these combustions will continue. While these superficial combustions are going on, fermentation and putrefaction are doing their work in the interior of the mass by the developed germs of the *anaérobies*, which not only do not require oxygen for their life, but which oxygen actually kills. Little by little, at length, by this work of fermentation and slow combustion, the phenomenon is accomplished. Whether in the free atmosphere, or under the earth, which is always more or less impregnated with air, all animal and vegetable matters end by disappearing.'

During the terrible days of the supremacy of the Commune in Paris at the end of the Franco-German War, Pasteur was occupied in the laboratory of M. Duclaux, at Clermont-Ferrand, in studying the diseases of beer, with a view to attempt to raise French beer to the higher standard of the German brewers. Beer is naturally more prone to disease than wine on account of the comparatively large quantity of gummy and saccharine matters which it contains in a state favourable to rapid decay. When the fermentation of the wort of beer sets in at the high temperature to which it is raised in mashing, the liquid requires to be rapidly cooled. So long as it remains between the temperatures of 77° and 95° of Fahrenheit's scale, it is peculiarly liable to be attacked by the injurious ferments proper to acetic, lactic, and butyric acids. If the must of beer were spontaneously fermented like the must of grape-juice, an acid or putrid liquid would invariably be produced in the place of beer. In the old process of what was technically known as high fermentation, which is also the one that is still employed with the bitter beers and pale ales of England, the fermenting liquid was kept in barrels, at a temperature ranging from 64° to 68° Fahr. In the process of 'low fermentation,' which is more generally employed by the brewers of Germany and France, a slow fermentation is established at a lower temperature, during which the yeast settles down to the bottom of the tubs and casks. The wort is then transferred to open tuns, and the fermentation is carried on at a temperature as low as 43° Fahr., which is maintained by means of floating cylinders filled with ice for from ten to twenty days. This low-fermentation beer is principally prepared in the winter season, and is preserved in ice-caves until the summer. The cost of its production is on this account comparatively high. Twenty-two gallons of the beer require something like two hundredweights of ice for their maturation. The wort of beer, after it has been raised to the boiling point, may be kept indefinitely if it be mixed only with pure yeast, and if it be preserved from contamination with extraneous germs that are diffused through the air. The beers fermented and kept at low temperatures to some extent fulfil this condition. By the employment of ice, the brewer is able to meet the demands of a long period of consumption without any great risk of contamination by accidental impurities. But Pasteur has introduced an additional safeguard, even more sure than the low-temperature fermentation. He has taught the brewers to bottle the beer

when the fermentation is approximately complete, and then to expose the bottles for a short time to a temperature ranging between 122° and 131° Fahr. By this management all extraneous germs of undesirable ferments are killed, and the beer consequently remains sound for long periods of time. This is essentially the practice which is now pursued upon a very large scale, and which is familiarly known as the Pasteurisation of beer. In addition to the adoption of this process, the principle chiefly insisted upon by Pasteur is that the wort shall be protected whilst cooling from all organisms accidentally floating in the air, and that the leaven used for the wort shall be absolutely pure and itself free from contaminating organisms. At the recent Exhibition of Amsterdam, M. Velten of Marseilles showed bottles half full of a perfectly clear beer, which had been tapped at the opening of the Exhibition, and left in this exposed state to prove the keeping powers of the liquid. This was beer which had been subjected to Pasteur's method of preservation.

Pasteur next directed his attention to the changes that are involved in the manufacture of vinegar, an industry which is pursued upon a large scale at Orleans. In this manufacture the influence of the free access of air is required. When a bottle of wine which has turned sour is opened and examined, it is found that all the oxygen which had remained in the bottle has disappeared, and that nitrogen is contained in its place. Alcohol, at the same time, has also disappeared, and has been replaced by acetic acid. It is not, however, as was once conceived, simply that alcohol has been changed into acetic acid by the chemical influence of oxygen. It has been proved by direct experiment again and again that pure water, mixed with alcohol until the mixture has the same strength as ordinary wines, will remain in free contact with air without generating the slightest trace of acetic acid. Liebig assumed that it was the absence of a dead albuminoid substance from the pure alcoholic solution that was the reason for this immunity from change, and consequently classed the transformation of alcohol into vinegar as a fermentative process. Pasteur, on the other hand, proved that the dead albuminoid substance has nothing to do with the matter. He showed that, although a little wine hermetically sealed up in a bottle in which some air has been allowed to remain will turn sour when left to itself, a similar result will in no case ensue if the bottle be placed for a few minutes after sealing in water raised to a tempera-

ture of 140° Fahr. But this is certainly not due to the destruction of the so-called albuminoid ferment of Liebig by the heat, because if the bottle is opened after the wine is cooled, and air is then blown into it by bellows, the wine does certainly turn sour. Pasteur, however, carried his demonstration even further than this. He entirely removed the dead albuminoid substance from the wine, and added in its place a small quantity of phosphates of ammonia, potash, and magnesia, and then sealed the wine up, and left it to itself. In due course of time, this wine underwent the acidifying transformation, and turned into vinegar. The conclusion at which Pasteur arrived was that the true agent of the transformation was a small living organism, the *mycoderma aceti*, analogous to the organisms observed in yeast and in the ferment of lactic acid, and that the albuminoid ingredient, alluded to by Liebig, served no other purpose than that of furnishing food for the living organisms. But these organisms are killed when wine, in a bottle, is heated to 140° Fahr., and after they are killed, no transformation or acidification of the wine takes place until a fresh supply of the little living agents of the change is again incidentally introduced, by blowing air into the bottle. Pasteur thus connected his theory of the operation of living ferments with the production of vinegar. M. Valéry Radot recapitulates the view entertained by Pasteur in the following words:—

‘It is easy to see that the formation of vinegar is always preceded by the development, on the surface of the wine, of a little plant, formed of strangulated particles, of an extreme tenuity, and the accumulation of which sometimes takes the form of a hardly visible veil, sometimes of a wrinkled film of very slight thickness, and greasy to the touch, because of the various fatty matters which the plant contains.’

The little living ferment has the notable property of condensing large quantities of oxygen upon the alcohol, and of thereby transforming the alcohol into acetic acid. But, in order to accomplish its task, it must have appropriate food furnished for its support, such as albuminoid substance and phosphates of magnesia and potash, which are all ordinary ingredients of wine. Upon acidulating the alcoholised water containing ammonia, potash, and magnesia, with a little pure acetic acid, Pasteur was enabled to exhibit the minute living organism, the *mycoderma aceti*, developing, and the alcohol undergoing transformation into vinegar. This organism obviously belongs to the *aërobic* class of living ferments.

The manufacture of vinegar at Orleans under Pasteur's plan consists in mixing three parts of wine with one part of vinegar already formed, and then sowing the ferment-organism upon the surface of the liquid by a wooden spatula. When the mixture thus fertilised is left standing at a temperature ranging from 59° to 77° Fahr., the surface becomes covered, within forty-eight hours, with a film composed of a copious brood of the organism. These enter upon their proper work, and after a few days all the wine is found to have been converted into vinegar. The organism of the ferment is easily procured in the first instance. It is one of the so-called 'spontaneous' productions, which are sure to appear of their own accord on the surface of liquids suitable for their development. Everywhere in wine, in vinegar, and in air, there exist the germs of this ubiquitous little body. It makes its appearance in the first instance as patches of grey scum.

In the earlier mode of conducting the manufacture of vinegar at Orleans, large barrels were half-filled with the vinous liquid, and kept in a suitable temperature, and a few pints of vinegar were drawn off from each barrel every eight days, and replaced by the same quantity of fresh wine. The chief drawback to this system of manufacture was that it was a very slow process. It required three or four months to start the operation. Under the improved method, perfected by Pasteur, ninety-five litres of vinegar are not uncommonly drawn off from one hundred litres of wine within eight or ten days. But there is one difficulty that has to be met. Wherever vinegar is preserved in vessels for any material length of time, it is observed to become turbid and impoverished. This is because the organism of the ferment is able, in the end, to feed upon the vinegar which it has itself produced, transforming it, as it does so, into carbonic acid, and a small residue of decaying albuminoid substance and mineral matter, the results of the decomposition of the organisms. Antagonistic organisms belonging to the putrefactive process also come into play in the deeper parts of the liquid, and tend to the spoiling of the vinegar. The two forms of living organisms enter upon a competitive struggle for existence, in which, if they are left to themselves, the agents of the putrefactive process win in the end. Pasteur turns the flank of this difficulty by the simple expedient of not leaving the enemy time to complete their invasion. He removes all the residue at frequent and regulated intervals, carefully cleaning the vats, and starting the process of aceti-

fication afresh. All the newly made vinegar is thus drawn off before the contaminating organisms have made their appearance in any force.

From his successful investigations into the fermentation of vinegar, Pasteur returned to the consideration of wine, and to the study of various irregular and incidental influences which tend to its injury. He observed that the aging of wine is chiefly dependent on oxidation—the absorption into the wine of the oxygen which was previously loosely mingled with the liquid. New wine, deprived of air, and hermetically sealed up in glass vessels, does not age. The great difficulty in the management of wine is to allow the liquid to be oxygenated to a suitable degree, but at the same time to prevent its incidental deterioration from the action of extraneous ferments of an injurious character. The *mycoderma aceti*—the vinegar ferment—is incapable of attacking new wine; but there is an analogous micro-organism, known as the *mycoderma vini*, which is capable of feeding upon new wine, but which deposits nothing in it that is injurious to its quality. If the germs of the vinegar-ferment are sown in sound new wine, they do not develop or multiply. The *mycoderma vini* in its turn refuses to flourish in old wine, but as wine advances in age, the *mycoderma vini*, which cannot continue to thrive, undergoes a kind of putrescent decay, and the vinegar-ferment then feeds upon it, develops in activity, and ultimately produces contamination in the wine. Various other disorders in wine are produced by extraneous ferments incidentally established. The flat state, which is recognised as ‘turned wine,’ is the work of certain minute filamentous organisms of extreme tenuity. The ‘bitterness’ occasionally found in Burgundy wines, and the so-called greasiness of the white wines of the basin of the Loire, are referable to a similar agency. M. Valéry Radot says:—

‘In short, according to Pasteur’s observations, the deterioration of wines should not in any case be attributed to a natural working of the constituents of the wine, proceeding from a sort of interior spontaneous movement, which would only be affected by variations of temperature or atmospheric pressure; they are, on the contrary, exclusively dependent on microscopic organisms, the germs of which exist in the wine from the moment of the original fermentation which gave it birth. What vast multitudes of germs of every kind must there not be introduced into every vintage tub! What modifications do we not meet with in the leaves and in the fruit of each individual spoilt vine! How numerous are the varieties of organic dust to be found on the stems of the bunches, on the surface of the grapes, on the implements

of the grape-gatherers! What varieties of moulds and mildews! A vast proportion of these germs are evidently sterilised by the wine, whose composition, being at the same time acid, alcoholic, and devoid of air, is so little favourable to life. But is it to be wondered at that some of these exterior germs, so numerous, and possessing in a more or less marked degree the anaërobic character, should find, at certain moments in the state of the wine, the right conditions for their existence and multiplication?'

For these troubles and defects Pasteur sagaciously applied the same remedy which he had found so efficacious in the case of beer. It proved that, to secure the wine from all these injurious effects which are connected with the work of living micro-organisms, it was only necessary to raise the wine, in a bottled state, to a temperature of 140° Fahr. for a few instants. He placed bottles of the same wine side by side, of which some had been subjected to this heating process, and others left in the natural condition. In the latter case a cloudy deposit, abundantly charged with filamentous organisms and with insoluble colouring matter, invariably appeared in six weeks; whereas, in the bottles that had been subjected to heat, no deposit of any kind ever appeared. A Burgundian winegrower, M. de Vergnette, claimed that he had employed the same remedy before it had been suggested by Pasteur. But it ultimately appeared that M. de Vergnette had only adopted the expedient in the case of rich, full-bodied wines, and that he had done so under the notion that he was in this way hastening the natural maturation of the wines; whereas Pasteur, on the other hand, had declared that it was the wines of doubtful soundness that most required this protective treatment. The weakest wine, and that most disposed to become sour or bitter or to turn greasy, was effectually preserved from injurious change after one minute's exposure to the high temperature. The bottles were placed in a bath, with the water rising quite up to the wire of the corks, and an open bottle filled with water was used for fixing the temperature by the insertion of a thermometer. The bath was heated up to 140° Fahr., and all the bottles then withdrawn. In such circumstances soundness was insured. In the year 1865, a representative commission of the wine-merchants of Paris met at the École Normale, at Pasteur's request, to inquire into the efficacy of this process. A series of tastings of heated and unheated wines took place, with the curious, but perhaps not unnatural, result that there was a great difference of opinion amongst the tasters. In the end, however, Pasteur succeeded in

proving that this uncertainty was due to caprice of the palate in the tasters, rather than to any failure in his process. In one amusing instance, he furtively presented two glasses of wine, taken from the same bottle, for comparison, and highly qualified experts decided that one glass was of distinctly superior quality to the other. The decision of the commission was, in the end, that there was certainly no injury produced in the quality of the heated wines, and that if there was any difference in the samples which had, and had not, been submitted to the application of the process, it was to be attributed to discrepancy of taste, rather than to alteration in the wine.

It was of course impossible that Pasteur should thus busy himself with the doings of these microscopic organisms without getting involved in one of the most fertile of all the fields of controversial discussion—the question, namely, of spontaneous generation, the suggestion of which M. Valéry Radoth traces to Van Helmont's recipe for the artificial generation of a brood of mice, the instruction being to deposit a dirty shirt and a handful of corn in a pot together for twenty-one days. M. Pouchet, the Director of the Museum of Natural History at Rouen, declared, in 1858, that he could artificially generate microscopic organisms at will. Pasteur at once denied that this could be done. Space does not serve to follow the careful experimenter through his ingenious labours to support his denial. It must suffice to say that, through his own experimental researches, he arrived at the same conclusion which has been reached by Professor Tyndall and other high authorities. In a lecture given at the Sorbonne, he announced his own decision in the matter in the following words:—

‘There is not one circumstance known at the present day which justifies the assertion that microscopic organisms come into the world without germs, or without parents like themselves. Those who maintain the contrary have been the dupes of illusions and of ill-conducted experiments, tainted with errors which they know not how either to perceive or to avoid. Spontaneous generation is a chimera.’

It so happened in 1849 that after a good year of silk production in the South of France, an epidemic disease appeared amongst the worms, which led to great devastation and loss. Large numbers of the caterpillars died in the earliest stages of their existence, and those which survived were of a stunted size, and lost their appetite. Rusty spots appeared upon their heads, rings, and feet, with a further succession of deaths day by day. The disease was called ‘*pébrine*,’ on

account of the 'peppered' appearance which the skins assumed. The epidemic gradually spread from France to Spain, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Syria, and the Caucasus, until in the end the extreme east of the islands of Japan seemed to be the only place free from the destructive pestilence.

In the year 1865 the mischief had become so serious in France that a commission was formed to inquire into the matter. M. Dumas, who had a personal interest in one of the affected districts, was appointed recorder of the commission. It at once occurred to him that Pasteur was the man from whom help should be sought, and he consequently urged his friend to undertake the direction of the inquiry. Pasteur was at the time unwilling to turn aside from his labours with the ferments, but, in the end, fortunately yielded to the pressure which was brought to bear upon him, and placed himself at the command of the commission. He started for Alais, one of the centres of the silk cultivation, where the plague was raging in its utmost virulence, on June 6, 1865. With his mind full of the results of his previous investigations, it was not difficult for him to get upon the right track. Within a few hours of his arrival at Alais, he affirmed with the utmost confidence that the disease was due to the influence of a living organised corpuscle introduced as a contagion from without into the body of the worm; and, indeed, was able to show the corpuscle to some of his colleagues on the commission. Twenty days afterwards he had satisfied himself that the noxious germs developed themselves chiefly in the cocoons and moths, and that this must be looked upon as the key of the position. He then proceeded to test the soundness of his view by inoculating sound worms from the corpuscular growth. He pounded up a diseased silkworm with a little water, painted some mulberry leaves with the pulp, and fed healthy worms with these leaves. The corpuscular organisms very soon appeared in the membranes of the intestine, and the characteristic spots of the 'pébrine' were developed on the heads and rings. The worms in the cocoons became little else than corpuscular pulp. The essential part of the disease, in Pasteur's opinion, was the destruction of the digestive powers of the worm by the presence of the parasitic organisms in the intestines. The 'pébrine' spots were analogous to the eruption on the skin in human exanthematous disease. The excretions of the diseased worms were filled with the corpuscles shed from the lining membrane of the intestinal canal, and this, falling upon the mulberry leaves, went with

the food into the bodies of fresh worms. The caterpillars also appeared to inoculate each other by scratches inflicted by the sharp hooks at the ends of their fore-feet. The parasitic corpuscle is lodged in the eggs of the contaminated moths, but does not appear in its fully developed activity until the egg is advanced into the chrysalis and moth state.

By prolonged study year after year, Pasteur proved that moths free from corpuscles never produced a contaminated egg, and that by separating the healthy from infected eggs a complete immunity from the disease might be secured. To accomplish this, it was only necessary to crush up a moth with a little water; the examination of the water with a microscope then immediately revealed the corpuscle if it was present. The organisms are so minute that they escape destruction even under the rude stroke of the pestle and mortar. M. Valéry Radot describes in the following passage the process of protection which has been established:—

‘The cocoons are finished, and the appearance of the moths alone is waited for. They arrive, and they pair. Then begins the work of the cultivator who is careful about the production of his eggs. He separates the couples at the end of the day, laying each female moth by itself on a little linen cloth suspended horizontally. The females lay their eggs. After the laying he takes each female in turn, and secures her by a pin passed through the wings to a folded corner of the little cloth, where are grouped some hundreds of eggs which she has laid. The male moth also might be pinned in another corner of the cloth, but the examination of the male is useless, as it has been found that he does not communicate the *pebrine*. The female moth, having been desiccated by free contact with the air, is examined at leisure, it may be even in the autumn or winter. Nothing is easier than to ascertain whether there are any corpuscles in its dead body. The moth is crushed in a mortar, and mixed with a little water, and then a drop of the mixture is examined by the microscope. If corpuscles be found, the bit of cloth corresponding to the examined moth is known, and burnt with all the eggs it contains.’

The investigations of Pasteur thus in a few brief years matured a plan of preservation which has proved susceptible of the widest application, and which is now almost universally adopted throughout the silkworm districts:—

‘In the Basses-Alpes, in Ardèche, in Gard, in the Drôme, and in other countries, may be met with everywhere, at the time of cultivation, workshops where hundreds of women and young girls are occupied, with a remarkable division of labour, and under the strictest supervision of skilful overseers, in pounding the moths, in examining them microscopically, and in sorting and classifying the little cloths upon which the eggs are deposited.’

Pasteur found that there was another and quite distinct form of disease, known as *morts flats* or *flacherie*, associated with the ravages of *pébrine*, in which a contagious micro-organism, bearing the form of a vibrio or rod, and developing itself in connected chains, was also present. The contagion of the *flacherie* surpasses that of the *pébrine* in duration, but is not so immediately destructive in its ravages. It is more open to the influence of hygienic management than *pébrine*. It only becomes troublesome when the constitution of the worm is depraved by general insanitary conditions. The destruction of all unsound eggs is also adopted with it, because the weak-constituted worms, which are most prone to contract the disease, may in this way be most certainly weeded out.

A very sad passage in Pasteur's life has now to be spoken of. In the month of October 1868 he was attacked with paralysis on one side. In the conviction that he was near to the termination of his work, he dictated to his wife a note respecting some conclusions at which he had arrived, to be formally communicated to the Academy of Sciences. He said touchingly to his friend, Sainte-Claire Deville, at this time, 'I regret to die. I should have liked to render more service to my country.' Happily for his country and for the world, this noble aspiration was not in vain. He did not die. For some months he was almost incapable of exertion of any kind. In the beginning of the year 1869 he had himself carried in his helpless state to the neighbourhood of Alais, that he might direct the continuance of his investigations from his arm-chair. In the following year he was again at Alais, and soon after traversed France and Italy in a railway carriage. He visited at that time the Villa Vicentina, near Trieste, a silk estate belonging to the late Prince Imperial of France, and only returned to France at the breaking out of the Franco-German War. He has never entirely recovered the use of his limbs, and limps like a wounded man. But he has gradually regained a very considerable power of movement, and is still able to bear intellectual exertion—as his welcome presence in the recent meetings of the International Medical Congress in London satisfactorily testified.

About the time of the conclusion of the great national war, Pasteur*prophetically remarked that the 'etiology of contagious diseases was on the eve of having unexpected light shed upon it.' In 1862 he had observed that a human disorder associated with an alkaline decomposition of the urine was connected with the presence in the deranged secre-

tion of a minute vibrio, or microscopic organism, very closely resembling an organism which he had found in the ferment of butyric acid, produced from one of the fermentable constituents of butter. This disorder was treated successfully under Pasteur's suggestion by the injection of a weak solution of boracic acid, an agent known to be antagonistic to the continuance of vibrionic life. It was only three years after this that Professor Lister, of Edinburgh, was entering upon his successful course of antiseptic treatment of wounds inflicted by the surgeon for curative purposes. About the same time, or very soon afterwards, numerous indefatigable observers, notably amongst them Dr. Rayer, Dr. Davanne, Professors Jaillard and Leplat, Dr. Koch, and Paul Bert, had been persistently studying a deadly disease which attacked the sheep, the horse, the cow, the rabbit, and was certainly communicable to man, and which was known under the various designations of *sang-de-rate*, *maladie du sang*, *charbon*, *Milzbrand*, the Siberian plague, splenic fever, anthrax, and malignant pustule, when it decimated the flocks and herds of France, Spain, Italy, Russia, Hungary, and Brazil. Dr. Rayer and Dr. Davanne observed that in the blood of animals suffering from these diseases, small thread-like organisms, about twice the length of an ordinary human blood-corpuscle, and apparently not endowed with any spontaneous power of motion, were found, resembling very much, as they thought, Pasteur's vibrios of butyric acid. Jaillard and Leplat doubted whether Davanne's filaments could be made to produce splenic fever by inoculation, and a somewhat warm controversy arose between the advocates of the opposite views. In 1876 the German physician, Dr. Koch, appeared as an uncompromising ally of the one party, and Paul Bert as a no less unflinching supporter of the opposite side. It was in this state of affairs that Pasteur resolved to take up the important inquiry, and associated with himself in the work M. Joubert, who had formerly been one of his pupils at the Ecole Normale, and who was eminently well qualified to render him the assistance which he required in his paralysed state. Pasteur at once fell back upon the method which had rendered him such good service in his earlier investigations. He carefully prepared a pure, sterilised cultivation-liquid for the nourishment* of the germs, and introduced into this a minute drop of splenic-fever blood. He next repeated the process of cultivation as many as twenty times, in order to separate any accidental contamination that might have been present in the first supply, sowing

a drop of each fresh cultivation in the preparation that next succeeded it. He then found that a small droplet of the finished cultivation was adequate to cause certain death, with all the symptoms of splenic fever, within two or three days, if injected into the skin of a rabbit or sheep. He allowed tubes of the cultivated contagion to remain at rest some days in the cellars of the Observatory of Paris, where a very equable temperature was maintained, and then proved that no mischief resulted from inoculating with the clear supernatant liquid, but that death certainly ensued when the lower portion, into which the living organisms invariably settled, was used. In a paper, which Pasteur communicated to the Academy of Sciences in his own name and in that of his colleague, M. Joubert, he affirmed that the 'bacteria, 'bacterides, filaments, and rods'—in other words, the living bacilli or micro-organisms, which had been discovered by Davanne and Rayer in 1850—were the real causes of all these terrible diseases. Jaillard and Leplat found that animals died after inoculation with splenic-fever blood, but that the contagium-organisms of Pasteur were not reproduced in such cases. Pasteur explained this by showing that the splenic-fever bacillus is an aérobic organism, and only active in the presence of air, and that very shortly after death from splenic fever an anaérobic form of micro-organism is developed, which produces septicæmia or virulent putrefaction, and feeds upon the aérobic germ in doing so. Pasteur showed how the bacillus of splenic fever may be separated from the putrefactive vibrio of septicæmia by cultivation. From a mixed contagium, containing both forms of morbid organisms, he produced splenic fever or septicæmia at will, according as he carried on his cultivation in the presence or absence of air. The blood of an animal killed by splenic fever communicates that disease if introduced immediately into the circulation of a living animal, but it communicates septicæmia instead if it is used in the same way twenty-four hours after death. Jaillard and Leplat's cases were killed by septicæmia, and not by splenic fever; and therefore no organisms of the latter disease could have been reproduced.

Dogs and pigs are not very readily sensitive to the contagion of splenic fever. Fowls appear to enjoy a complete immunity from its influence. Pasteur believes that in this latter case the result is due to the temperature of the blood of the fowl being a little too high for the development of the splenic-fever bacillus. By artificially lowering the tem-

perature of fowls he rendered them amenable to the disease. In the very admirable little treatise on 'Micro-organisms and Disease,' which at the present time takes rank as one of the best scientific introductions to the study of specific micro-organisms, considered as operative in the production of contagious disease, Dr. Klein, of the Medical School of St. Bartholomew's Hospital, inquires very carefully into the influence of temperature and other physical conditions upon these microscopic organisms. He shows that most of the microbes require for their propagation a temperature lying somewhere between 64° and 104° Fahrenheit. Most of them are killed by the temperature of boiling water, and many of them by temperatures ranging between 122° and 140°. A temperature as low as that of freezing water destroys most of them, and thorough desiccation does the same thing. But many of them have the power, under special circumstances, of producing abundant crops of spore-like germs, which are not killed as readily, and which are capable of developing into the more mature state of the microbes after prolonged periods of inactivity. Many of these spores may be exposed to the temperature of boiling water for more than an hour without losing their vitality, and others will revive after having been dried up for long periods. It is, however, admitted by all competent authorities that a temperature of 280° Fahrenheit is speedily fatal to every form of microbe organism.

It should, perhaps, be here remarked that the so-called cultivation of the micro-organisms concerned in the production of contagious disease, before incidentally alluded to, has been matured into an elaborately perfect art by the ingenuity and skill of the investigators who have followed Pasteur. Dr. Klein, in his 'Micro-organisms and Disease,' has given a very complete and intelligible account of the process. The cultivation-liquid, in which the germs to be experimented upon are sown, is first sterilised. That is to say, it is deprived of every trace of organised germs, excepting the one kind that is to be especially experimented upon. This indispensable preliminary, however, is only to be accomplished by the exercise of the most consummate skill. All the articles used in the process—flasks, culture-tubes, filters, calico and cotton wool—have to be exposed for several hours, in every part, to a temperature ranging from 298° to 334° Fahr., until no trace of living organisation can remain in connexion with them. The solutions of organic matter, or cultivation-liquids as they are termed,

provided to serve as seed-beds for the introduced germs, are boiled for an hour on two successive days in bulb-shaped glass vessels, and then plugged up with sterilised cotton wool, so arranged as to exclude, by sifting out, all aerial impurities, at the same time that pure filtered air is allowed to pass through. These sterilised seed-beds are kept for some time between the two boilings at a temperature ranging between 89° and 97° Fahr. This is done to make sure that all refractory spore-forms are advanced into the mature states of organisation, which are amenable to the destructive powers of heat. The prepared liquid is then left, as a final test, for two or three weeks in the temperature of from 89° to 97° Fahr.; and if it remain limpid and clear for that time, it is accepted as reliable for the purposes of experiment. If imperfectly sterilised, it does not remain limpid and clear, and it then has to be rejected for all purposes of careful investigation. The cotton wool used for plugging is exposed in a suitable chamber to a high temperature for several days until it is slightly singed. All needles and forceps used for moving the cotton-wool plugs are heated in an open flame immediately before they are employed. Scissors, knives, syringes, and pipettes are subjected to the same inexorable ordeal. It is really wonderful to see cultivation-tubes, the contents of which have in this way been effectively sterilised and freed from organic impurities, remain in a clear limpid state for months, although only loosely plugged at the mouth with the charred cotton wool, and then to observe the same tubes become charged with teeming broods of micro-organisms, presenting themselves to the eye as a flocculent milky cloud, twenty-four hours after the plugs of cotton wool have been removed from the mouths of the tubes. The glass bulb, with a long neck drawn out by the blow-pipe to a small diameter, the softened glass being at the same time bent to and fro into a sinuous or hill-and-dale form, answers the same purpose as the plugs of cotton wool, because all aerial impurities get caught in the little pools of liquid that condense into and settle down in the depending hollows of the tube. Pasteur first demonstrated the power of the cotton-wool plug and of the narrow sinuous necks to intercept organised germs from liquids capable of serving them as food. In the so-called laboratory of Pasteur at the International Health Exhibition of 1884, specimens of the most putrescible liquids were shown during the entire term of the Exhibition in plugged or sinuous-necked tubes, which remained perfectly limpid and pure to

the end of the ordeal. Pasteur is in the habit of showing specimens of cultivation-liquids which have been preserved unchanged in this way for several years.

The micro-organism, which is now held to be the primary cause of splenic fever, was first observed by Pollender in 1849. It received the name of *bacteridium* from Davanne in France, and of *bacillus anthracis* from Cohn in Germany. It is described under this latter name in Dr. Klein's pages. In its fully developed form it is a small cylindrical or rod-shaped creature, only visible with the help of a powerful microscope.* It is longer than it is thick, multiplies by splitting spontaneously across its transverse diameter, and the successively formed segments then adhere loosely together like the links in a chain. Each rod is formed of an outer membrane or sheath, enclosing a small mass of finely granulated pulp or living protoplasm. It varies somewhat in size, being from the $\frac{1}{1250}$ to the $\frac{1}{1500}$ of an inch long, and scarcely more than the $\frac{1}{15000}$ part of an inch in diameter. When a spore-brood is about to be reproduced, glistening points appear in the protoplasmic pulp of the rods, around which more protoplasm gathers and condenses, until the spots shape themselves into egg-like bodies, which are enclosed within the outer sheath of the rod, and which are finally dispersed either by escaping free from the sheath, or by the rod spontaneously breaking itself up into fragments, or dissolving away and leaving the spores surrounded by a soft jelly-like substance. The ovoid spores develop ultimately into the mature rod-like form, when they are introduced into the blood of living animals. The spore-broods are only produced in the presence of a free supply of air. Pasteur believes that the spread of splenic fever amongst animals is mainly due to the earth having become infested with these vitally tenacious little bodies in consequence of animals affected by the disease having been buried in the ground. He has no doubt that earth-worms play no unimportant part in the dissemination of these spores by bringing them up to the surface of the soil, where they have the best facilities for carrying on their deadly work.

It should be here understood that the disease which is

* The exceeding minuteness of the organisms which are dealt with in these investigations will perhaps be better conceived from the statement that it has been estimated that as many as 50,000 of some of the smallest forms would be required to make up the bulk of a cheese-mite.

specifically dealt with in these remarks is a very grave and fatal one. It assumes somewhat modified forms in different animals that are obnoxious to its attack, and hence the various names, already alluded to, by which it is known. It does not occur in the human subject, unless when it has been derived by direct contagion from lower animals. The wool-sorter's disease, which is caught by men engaged in sorting the skins of dead animals, is one notorious instance in which the contagion is communicated in this way. In the form technically known as 'malignant pustule,' a carbuncular swelling surrounded by a profuse œdematous inflammation is one of the most marked features of the disease. In the so-called 'internal anthrax' and 'fièvre charbonneuse,' the carbuncular swelling is, for the most part, not developed, and death is brought about by a kind of general blood-poisoning.

The crowning triumph of Pasteur's very marvellous career now comes under notice. All that has been hitherto told in reference to his labours may be looked upon as constituting but the preparatory stages of his one great work. Whilst he was still engaged with his investigations into the nature of splenic fever, his attention was drawn to a destructive epidemic which was producing great ravages amongst fowls, and which came to be familiarly known in country districts as 'fowl-cholera.' The bird, when attacked, staggered about with drooping wings, and speedily sank into a deep sleep with bowed head and ruffled feathers which gave it the look of an inanimate ball. Death generally followed in a few hours, often without the animal moving from its place or rousing at all from its somnolent insensibility. A veterinary surgeon of Alsace who had given some attention to the disease suspected that a living micro-organism might be at the bottom of the mischief. Pasteur very soon afterwards discovered that a microbe of extreme minuteness and of the tribe of the 'micrococcus' was invariably present in the infected fowls, and that he could produce the disease at will by introducing these minute organisms into the blood of sound birds. He also discovered that whenever drops of a liquid containing these microbes was mixed with the food of healthy fowls the cholera disease was communicated to them, manifestly through the membranes of the intestinal canal. He next found that he could multiply the microbe itself by feeding it artificially in a decoction of fowl-flesh, and that a thousandth part of a drop of the artificial cultivation introduced upon a fine needle-point into the blood of a healthy

fowl was sufficient to produce the disease and cause death. After passing the artificial cultivation through a succession of decoctions, taking a needle-point droplet from the first to infect the second, and a similar droplet of the second to infect the third, and proceeding in the same way through a very considerable number of cultivations, it appeared that the virulence of the contagion was in no sense diminished. However many the successive cultivations of the microbe in the fowl-flesh decoctions, the last culture was invariably as deadly as the first. He also incontrovertibly settled the fact that this fowl-cholera microbe, like the bacillus of splenic fever, was an *aërobie* organism requiring contact with air for the support of its activity. Its vitality, too, was so tenaciously enduring that the blood of an infected fowl might be kept in hermetically sealed glass tubes for years without losing its deadly influence. The 'intuitive vision' which discerns in advance now came most momentously into play. It occurred to M. Pasteur, whilst experimenting with his fowls, to ask what would happen if, instead of following up each successive cultivation as rapidly as possible, a considerable time were allowed to elapse between each separate sowing of the microbes? Since they were *aërobie* organisms and subject to the influence of the air, might it not be that the virulence of the contagion would be softened by the agency of the oxygen to which each successive generation of the micro-organisms would in such circumstances be exposed? If, for instance, the second culture were not carried out until several weeks, or perhaps even months, had elapsed after the production of the first microbe brood, might it not very reasonably be expected that the power of the contagion would be weakened? To ascertain that, it would only be necessary to keep each cultivation in a glass flask which had its mouth plugged with cotton wool, so as to prevent the intrusion of extraneous germs at the same time that it allowed the entrance of pure filtered air. The experiment was tried, and the issue was exactly what had been intuitively foreseen. The modified contagion attenuated in this way rendered fowls that were inoculated by it more or less seriously ill, but not a single one amongst them died. After some days of a feverish state they all recovered appetite and health, and, still more wonderful to say, if these recovered birds were then in their turn inoculated by a most virulent form of the disease, which would certainly not have allowed one individual in a hundred of uninoculated birds to survive, they suffered only the most trifling malaise. Not one of them died. The

disease was capable of protecting from itself. It had the important characteristic that it could not attack any one individual a second time. The artificially weakened microbe produced a benign malady which was incapable of causing death, but which was quite capable of serving as a protection against the same disease in its more deadly form. The modified 'microbe' was essentially 'vaccine,' which was of a parallel nature to the 'vaccine' which Jenner had found cultivated and attenuated in the blood of the cow.* Pasteur followed up the clue he had thus fallen upon until he had satisfied his own mind that oxygen was the agent in the attenuating effect. He cultivated the fowl-cholera microbes in a sealed-up tube containing a very limited allowance of air, and he found that the enclosed microbes then rapidly appropriated all the oxygen contained in the tube, and after that remained without further change. Such specialised germs retained their virulence for apparently unlimited periods of time. Pasteur's own notion in reference to the mode of operation of an attenuated contagion is that such virus when cultivated in the body of a living animal deprives the globules of the blood of some special constituent which it takes the normal actions of the living body a long time to reproduce and restore.

As soon as Pasteur had satisfied his own mind in reference to the facts which have here been explained, he was eager to extend his experiments with attenuated contagion to the more deadly splenic fever. This was obviously the next step to be taken in the prosecution of his important research. From the first he perceived that the system of protection by an artificially attenuated virus could only be expected to apply in the case of a disease which was non-recurrent—in other words, which was not prone, in a general sense, to appear a second time in the same individual. But was splenic fever of this non-recurrent character? There was a great difficulty to be encountered in ascertaining this. Splenic fever was of so deadly a nature that scarcely any one who had been smitten with it ever recovered so as to give a chance for a second appearance of the disease. The solution of this difficulty, oddly enough, came almost by accident. A certain M. Louvrier, a veterinary surgeon of the Jura,

* It will be observed that Pasteur uses the term 'vaccine' for the attenuated virus in a general sense, and quite irrespective of its having been passed in cultivation through the blood of the cow, as Jenner's cowpox is.

professed that he had discovered a remedy for splenic fever, and Pasteur was requested to investigate the value of the alleged nostrum. Some cows which had been subjected to M. Louvrier's treatment were inoculated under Pasteur's direction with virulent splenic-fever contagion, and an equal number which had been subjected to no protective treatment were simultaneously inoculated in precisely the same way for the sake of instituting a comparison. An equal number of both these groups of cows died. The result of the trial was therefore decisive against the pretensions of M. Louvrier. But the trial had quite unintentionally placed in Pasteur's hands a considerable number of cows which had recovered after having been at death's door with all the advanced symptoms of splenic fever. When they were entirely free from their past illness, they were inoculated afresh with a full quantity of virulent splenic fever virus. Not a single one, however, of the re-inoculated cows showed the slightest trace of the disease. The question was therefore virtually solved. Splenic fever was a non-recurrent disease, and there was reasonable ground to hope that an attenuated and protective 'vaccine' of splenic fever as well as of fowl-cholera might be cultivated.

In the important investigation which followed, Pasteur's assistants, M. Chamberland and M. Roux, were associated with him. These experimentalists soon found that the splenic-fever contagium differed from the fowl-cholera contagium, previously operated with, in one notable particular. The microbe of the fowl-cholera multiplied solely by the division or fission of the little organism, whereas the microbe of the splenic fever reproduced itself both by the ordinary method of subdivision, and also by the production of broods of spores, and these spores, after the manner of their kind, were capable of being exposed for long periods of time without losing their morbid virulence. In the case of splenic fever, the contagious force of the disease was concentrated in a spore within twenty-four hours. The virulent influence of the contagion was then shut up closely in the spore (in a double membrane, or shell-coat) before the oxygen of the air had had any opportunity of attenuating the morbid agent. This important fact, which, at the first glance, seemed an insuperable obstacle in the experimenter's way, proved, in Pasteur's hands, the assured road to success. It at once occurred to the now well-trained experimentalist, that all he had to do was to find some means of destroying the spores, and he would then have to deal only with the

more specifically developed microbe, and might treat it as a body capable of yielding an attenuated contagion, or vaccine. Pasteur's daughter states that at this time her father carried about with him 'the face of an approaching discovery.'

The discovery, which was heralded in by this significant aspect, was that the splenic-fever microbe can be easily cultivated at a temperature of 108° or 109° Fahr.; but that at those temperatures the deadly and vitally tenacious spores cannot be developed. At such temperatures, therefore, the filamentous microbes of the disease can be cultivated in the assured absence of spores. When the contagium, deprived in this way of the spores, was used for the inoculation of sound animals, its virulence was found to be continually varying with the time of its exposure to the air, and consequently to be capable of generating, in the end, an attenuated contagium; or, in other words, a vaccine-virus which could produce a modified and softened form of infection, competent to protect from a recurrence of the disease, but quite incompetent to kill. On February 28, 1881, Pasteur made the memorable announcement to the Académie des Sciences that he had succeeded in producing a protective vaccine for this most terrible disorder. Upon the publication of this announcement, M. le Baron de la Rochette, the President of the Society of Agriculture of Melun, proposed to Pasteur that he should demonstrate the efficacy of his splenic-fever vaccination by a public experiment. Pasteur at once acceded to the suggestion, and it was arranged that fifty sheep should be placed at his disposal by the Society, and that twenty-five of these should be subjected to two inoculations, with intervals of from twelve to fifteen days between, from two vaccines of unequal strength; and that some days afterwards these twenty-five sheep, and at the same time the other twenty-five which had not been vaccinated, should be simultaneously inoculated with the virus of virulent splenic fever. Ten cows were also provided to be subjected to a similar ordeal, of which six had been vaccinated, and four not previously meddled with. Pasteur boldly and unhesitatingly affirmed that the twenty-five sheep which had not been vaccinated would perish, but that the twenty-five which had been vaccinated would resist the deadly virus. He also foretold that the six vaccinated cows would not take the disease, and that the four which had not been vaccinated would either die or be extremely ill. The experiments commenced on May 5, at a farm of the Commune of Pouilly-le-Fort, near

Melun, belonging to the Secretary-General of the Agricultural Society of Melun, who was also a veterinary doctor. On that day, twenty-four sheep, a goat, and six cows were inoculated with five drops of an attenuated splenic-fever virus. On May 17, the same thirty-one animals were again inoculated with a prepared and cultivated virus of a somewhat stronger character. On May 31, all the sixty animals were inoculated with a very virulent splenic-fever virus that had received no attenuation, the previously vaccinated and the non-vaccinated animals being operated upon alternately. The meeting was then adjourned for forty-eight hours to allow time for the contagion to do its work, and on June 2 more than two hundred persons assembled at Melun to witness the result. Those members of the International Medical Congress who were present at the fifth General Meeting in St. James's Hall, in London, on August 8 in the same year, and therefore less than three months after the experiment, will remember the vigorous words in which Louis Pasteur himself related the result of the ordeal to an assembly of something like three thousand hearers, who were taking part in the Congress. He said :—

‘Cinquante moutons furent mis à ma disposition. Nous en vaccinâmes vingt-cinq, les vingt-cinq autres ne subirent aucun traitement. Quinze jours après environ, les cinquante moutons furent inoculés par le microbe charbonneux le plus virulent. Les vingt-cinq vaccinés résistèrent ; les vingt-cinq non-vaccinés moururent, tous charbonneux, en cinquante heures. Depuis lors, dans mon laboratoire, on ne peut plus suffire à préparer assez de vaccin pour les demandes des fermiers. En quinze jours nous avons vacciné dans les départements voisins de Paris près de vingt mille moutons et un grand nombre de bœufs, de vaches, et de chevaux. Cette expérience a été renouvelée le mois dernier, à la ferme de Lambert, près de Chartres. . . . Le résultat fut celui de Pouilly-le-Fort : résistance absolue de vaccinés, mort des non-vaccinés.’

M. Valery Radot gives, in his ‘*Histoire d'un Savant*,’ the further results of this experiment. He says that when, on June 2, the Prefect of the Seine-et-Marne, senators, general councillors, journalists, doctors, veterinary surgeons, and farmers came together at Melun, out of the twenty-five sheep which had not been vaccinated, twenty-one were dead ; the goat was dead, two other sheep were dying, and the last was certain to die in the evening. The non-vaccinated cows had all voluminous swellings at the point of inoculation behind the shoulder, intense fever, and could no longer eat. The twenty-five vaccinated sheep were in full health and

gaiety. The vaccinated cows showed no tumour, had suffered no elevation of temperature, and were feeding quietly. Pasteur was forthwith, in consequence of this experiment, obliged to establish a manufactory for splenic-fever vaccine in the Rue Vauquelin, a short distance from his laboratory, and at the end of the year, had vaccinated 33,946 animals. In 1882 the number of vaccinated animals amounted to 399,102, including 47,000 oxen and 2,000 horses; and in 1883, 100,000 more animals were added to the list. In 1881 and 1882 the mortality from splenic fever was ten times less in the vaccinated than in non-vaccinated sheep, and did not exceed 1 in 740. In cows and oxen the mortality was fourteen times less in the vaccinated than in the non-vaccinated; and it was already ascertained that the immunity from the contagion certainly lasted more than a full year.

We are now in the position more clearly to understand what Pasteur was about when he was watched by M. Valery Radot near his laboratory at l'École Normale, sucking up the saliva of a mad dog into a glass tube held in his mouth. On December 10, 1880, Dr. Lannelongue drew the attention of Pasteur to a child of five years of age, dying of hydrophobia, in the Hospice Trousseau. Pasteur seized the opportunity to inoculate two rabbits with mucus taken from the palate of this child four hours after its death. The rabbits died in thirty-six hours. More rabbits were inoculated from those, and they died also. Pasteur found in the blood of these rabbits a special microbe-organism which he was able to cultivate in properly prepared infusions of veal. These infusions continued to be of deadly virulence when cultivated rapidly one after the other. Dr. Thuillier made as many as eighty successive cultivations from them, and found that the eightieth cultivation killed as promptly as the first. But when the successive cultivations were allowed to remain for some time in contact with air before passing from one culture to the next, an attenuated virus was obtained which made rabbits ill, when introduced into their blood, without causing death, and which made them proof against the deadly influence of fresh hydrophobic virus. Pasteur next proceeded to apply the virus of hydrophobia direct to the brain-substance of dogs, and he found that the virus when introduced in this way was more rapidly destructive. He inferred from these experiments a high degree of probability that there is a specific microbe of hydrophobia, and that its proper cultivation-field is the substance of the brain, the spinal column,

and the nerves. He believes that the virus is conveyed to the saliva of affected dogs by the nerves that enter the salivary glands, and he is at the present time availing himself of every possible opportunity to 'cultivate' an acquaintance with mad dogs, in the hope that he will yet find it possible also to 'cultivate' a softened contagion of rabies, which will serve as a protective vaccine for the prevention of death from the disease. M. Roux, Pasteur's laboratory assistant, has given a cautious, and no doubt perfectly reliable summary, of the present state of Pasteur's labours in this latest phase of his work in the following passage, taken from one of the last pages of M. Valéry Radot's 'History.' He says :—

'If we examine with care a little of the pulp taken freshly from the brain of a rabid animal, and compare it with the same substance from the brain of a healthy animal, it is difficult to distinguish any difference between the two. In the rabid pulp, however, besides the granulations which are found in profusion in the healthy pulp, there seem to exist little grains of extreme minuteness, almost imperceptible even with the strongest microscopes. In the cephalo-rachidic liquid, so limpid in appearance, it is possible with great attention to detect similar little grains. Can this be the microbe of hydrophobia? Some do not hesitate to affirm that it is. For ourselves, as long as the cultivation of the microbe outside the organism has not been effected, and hydrophobia has not been communicated by means of artificial cultures, we shall abstain from expressing a definite opinion on the subject.'

Whatever may be the case in reference to the brain of the rabid dog, there certainly can be no doubt that M. Pasteur has, at any rate, microbe-organisms upon the brain. Professor Tyndall has put his finger upon the great mental characteristic of Pasteur when he speaks, in admiring words, of his work having lain so essentially in the direction of the verification of preconceived ideas—'of intending the mind' upon the facts looked for; and he is not less correct in his remark that Pasteur has a marvellous and exceedingly rare skill of distilling the essences of acquired facts and turning them into forecasts for further guidance in the as yet unoccupied fields of a very difficult department of human research. Whatever may be thought of the great Pasteurian dogma of the supremacy of microbe-organisation in the kingdom of contagious disease, it is simply impossible for any reasonable mind to do otherwise than bow before the irresistible strength of the experiment at Melun. The holocaust of the twenty-five sheep, by the side of the twenty-five pro-

tected ones, at the farm of Pouilly-le-Fort, as a piece of scientific forecast, can only be ranged by the side of such events as the discovery of Neptune under the forecasts of Leverrier and Adams. Pasteur, in almost prophetic tones, said to the assembled witnesses at Melun, 'I will kill twenty-five sheep, and I will preserve twenty-five, by the selfsame stroke;' and in fifty hours the work was done. In the prophet's own words, 'the twenty-five vaccinated animals survived, and the twenty-five unvaccinated died in the grasp of the deadly charbon.' There is no contending against the force of such evidence as that. A man so wilful and so strong in the resources of his art must be allowed, so far at least, to have his way.

M. Valery Radot gives, in his preface, an excellent reason for having undertaken to write a 'History of Pasteur's Life and Labours.' In a moment of confidential intercourse he asked his wife's father, M. Pasteur, why he did not himself write a book about the things he had done. The noteworthy answer of Pasteur to this appeal was, 'I could not waste my time in going back upon things already accomplished.' He was aware that he had yet too much work to do to trouble the world with *talk* about what he had done. M. Valery Radot, however, exercised a sound discretion when he thought that the tale should nevertheless be told. Under this inspiration he prepared his 'Histoire d'un Savant par un Ignorant.' The 'Histoire' was sent by Pasteur himself to Professor Tyndall to arrange for its translation into English, and it has been translated under his careful supervision, and presented to English readers with the sanction of an explanatory introduction from his own pen. In all this a pressing need has been excellently met. The really marvellous narrative of a very marvellous life has been attractively told, with a full explanation of all that most urgently requires to be understood, but with a condensation and succinctness also that leave little to be desired even by busy men in this exacting age of multitudinous books. The translation is worthy of the theme. In reference to it, it is not too much to say that an English reader may follow its pages with the feeling that he is engaged with an English book; and many, who know what translations too commonly are, will be aware that this is no faint praise. A translation requires to deal as much with idiom as with words. The translator has to select in the new language the idiom which most exactly, and most easily, expresses the meaning of the author who writes in a foreign tongue.

In this particular Lady Claud Hamilton may be congratulated on her success, assisted as she has no doubt been, in matters of scientific technicality, by a very competent hand.

Most well-informed physiologists will, of course, be aware that, in the present state of their science, some of the conclusions of Pasteur are still looked upon as forecasts of an enthusiast who sees 'new issues by intuitive vision in advance,' rather than as results which have been 'brought to the test and ordeal of experiment.' It is now pretty generally admitted on all hands that certain of the most deadly diseases of the contagious class are inseparably connected with the presence of, and communicable by, microbe-organisms of almost infinitely minute, and, apart from the microscope, of certainly altogether invisible dimensions. But it does not on that account of necessity follow that all contagions are living microbes, or that attenuated cultivation may be reckoned upon to stamp out ultimately all contagiously communicated disease. Such a desirable consummation may possibly be realised when the city of Hygeia has been built. But it is yet a realisation to be waited for, notwithstanding the magnificent success at Melun. A careful reader of Dr. Klein's excellent summary of the present state of the science of micro-organisms and of their influence in contagious disease will perhaps find consolation in the assurance, supported by very high authority, that the vast majority of the great army of micro-organisms with which the world is filled are incapable of finding an entrance into the living blood, that most of them refuse, even under the skill of a Pasteur, to be 'cultivated' into an attenuated contagion, and that the specific micro-organisms which are proved to have deadly power may be counted upon the fingers, and have a vital history, a recognised habit, and an individuality of their own. Dr. Klein, on this point, says:—

'Amongst the legion of different species of micrococci and bacilli occurring in putrid substances, the great majority are quite harmless; when introduced into the body of an animal, they are unable to grow and to multiply, and therefore are unable to produce any disturbance. But some few species there are which, although ordinarily growing and thriving in putrid substances, possess this power, that when introduced into the body of a suitable animal they set up here a specific disease.'

And again:—

'I have made a series of experiments with the view to obtain pure

cultivations of definite septic micro-organisms; various species of micrococci, bacterium termo, and bacillus subtilis, of which the morphological characters could with precision be ascertained, and which, at starting, were tested to be barren of any power of producing disease. I have cultivated these in pure cultivations for many generations, and under varying conditions, and then I have inoculated with them a large number of animals (mice, rabbits, and guinea-pigs), and, to put it briefly, I have not found that hereby any of them acquired the least pathogenic power.'

The broad fact in this matter, most probably, is that the proper work of these microbe-organisms in nature's scheme is to facilitate the resolution of the material which has played the part of vitalised structure into its primordial elements, that these may again become available for similar constructive purposes; but that there are special circumstances of abnormal occurrence in the complex intermeshings of conditions and events which enable some of these subtle agents to enter upon mischievous operations in the blood-streams of still living creatures, from which they are normally excluded by a rigorous law. It is with these abnormal circumstances, indeed, that the new band of microscopical pathologists are busying themselves. The work of this confraternity of investigators, however, as yet lies exclusively upon the frontiers of a large unexplored field—a far-stretching region which has to be traversed by circumspect steps before its fertile oases and its barren deserts can be held to have been brought under survey. The proud distinction of Louis Pasteur is that he has been, at the least, a great leader in this pioneer band. He has already investigated and described the life-history of an instructively typical series of micro-organisms, which are capable in appropriate surroundings of assuming the deadly powers of infectious disease; and it is for this momentous service that he deserves the grateful recognition which he receives from his contemporaries, and that he will henceforth be held in the reverential regard of the generations of earnest thinkers and workers that are yet to come.

- ART. III.—1. *Zoroaster*. By E. MARION CRAWFORD. 2 vols. London: 1885.
2. *History of the Parsis*. By DOSABHAI FRAMJI KARAKA, C.S.I. London: 1884.
3. *The Sacred Books of the East*. Edited by F. MAX MÜLLER. Volumes iv. and xxiii.: The Zend-Avesta, translated by JAMES DARMESTER. Volumes v. and xviii.: Pahlavi Texts, translated by E. W. WEST. Oxford: 1880-3.
4. *Ormazd et Ahriman, leurs Origines et leur Histoire*. Par J. DARMESTER. Paris: 1877.
5. *Essays on the Sacred Language, Writings, and Religion of the Parsees*. By MARTIN HAUG, Ph.D. Third edition, edited and enlarged by E. W. WEST, Ph.D. London: 1884.
6. *Ostiranische Kultur im Alterthume*. Von WILHELM GEIGER. Erlangen: 1882.
7. *Des Origines du Zoroastrisme*. Par C. DE HARLEZ. Paris: 1879.
8. *Avesta*. Livre sacré du Zoroastrisme, traduit du Texte Zend avec Notes et Introduction. Par C. DE HARLEZ. Paris: 1881.

LET us confess at once that it is not our intention to review the brilliant romance which stands at the head of these pages. Mr. Marion Crawford has succeeded in giving life and apparent reality to the gorgeous pageantry of Media, Persia, and Babylon. He takes us from the feast of Belshazzar to the court of Darius Hystaspes; and he has drawn the prophet and the sage of Iran in the forms of a warrior, a courtier, a statesman, and a mystic. The colouring is brilliant and the incidents are varied. But whatever interest the work may possess is purchased by an entire sacrifice of truth and probability. Time and space must vanish before the Prophet Daniel, the youthful Zoroaster, and Darius Hystaspes can be brought within the limits of the same canvas. The book is an enormous anachronism, and the Zoroaster of the novelist is a creation of his own fantastic imagination.

Our own purpose is entirely different. Although the life of the founder of the Faith of Iran is enveloped in mystery, insomuch that the period of his birth and existence is uncertain, there still remains on earth a people who represent, in

all its purity, his creed and sacred books, recently given to the English world, which record his teaching. The Parsees present a striking resemblance to the Jews. They are Monotheists; they are exiles; they are the children of a sacred law, which is as old as any existing institution of mankind. We think, therefore, it may interest our readers to trace the origin and the traditions of a faith in some respects akin to that of the Old Testament, and which is still professed by men who rank amongst the most honourable, moral, and industrious subjects of the British Crown.

It is startling to find Cyrus claiming a community of belief with Isaiah. Yet it was in avowed obedience to the Divine command conveyed in the prophecy concerning him, that he released Israel from captivity, and ordained the rebuilding of the Temple at Jerusalem. He was 'called by his name,' and he heard. Still afar off, he was saluted as the 'shepherd,' the 'anointed of the Lord'—the man 'girded' by Him to 'perform His pleasure.' He was, nevertheless, a Gentile conqueror like Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, Nabuchodonosor. But they were instruments of wrath to the chosen people, he of blessing. Why was he thus singled out? In what did he differ from them? The answer is simple. He differed from them by being on the side of light against darkness; by hating, if he was at times compelled to tolerate, idolatry; by setting himself, as well as he knew how, to seek the truth. And he arrived at a knowledge of it, incomplete, indeed, yet elevating and enlightening. The fundamental dogma of all religions deserving the name was familiar to him. The 'Auramazda' of his imperfect worship was no 'strange god,' but the one living Creator whom the Jews adored under the august title of Jehovah.

Once again, the fulfilment of Jewish prophecy found instruments and witnesses in Iran. Persian priests—the 'Magi' of St. Matthew's Gospel—were the first Gentile worshippers of Christ—the first drops of the great 'ocean' of humanity which was to be 'converted to Jerusalem.'

Analogy in religious belief has been continued and confirmed by analogy in misfortune. A world-wide dispersion reflects the world-wide mission of the Jews; a more restricted destiny has transplanted the uprooted Persian stock to the shore of Hindostan, whence, indeed, its ramifications may be found extending from Liverpool to Hongkong. The two communities, notwithstanding total ethnological diversity, possess many features of resemblance.

Each presents the curious and instructive spectacle of a nationality subsisting on a spiritual basis alone—of a people everywhere strangers, and nowhere more than in their original habitations. Without a country, without a centre, without a common voice or mouthpiece, without civil organisation, rulers, or laws administered by themselves, they maintain a separate and energetic existence through the vitality of an antique tradition. The same kind of adaptability, the same kind of inflexibility, is visible both in Jew and Parsi—adaptability to outer circumstances, inflexibility against inner conviction. Each willingly throws open to the ingress of the crowd the streets and alleys and market-places of his life; each resolutely holds the citadel of his soul against all comers. Each clings to the sublime wreck of what we may without offence call a superannuated religion.

The Iranians were the first among Indo-Europeans to lay hold of a truly monotheistic creed. Not but that our forefathers in Central Asia knew of a supreme and unapproachable Ruler—whether by the faint echo of a primitive revelation, or by the response of reason to the facts of the world, it would be unprofitable to discuss. But the conception was indistinct and imperfect. It was, probably from the first, closely associated, and, in some of its developments, came to be identified, with the most imposing of natural appearances. The divinity of the Aryans was a heaven-god, not a God of heaven, and, as such, was liable to be rivalled or dethroned by the subsequent elevation of more visibly active, if less majestic, powers of the same order.*

How one branch of the family arrived at an idea of the Supreme Being radically different from that entertained by the others, it now behoves us to enquire. Nor merely arrived at, but preserved it without sensible modification down to the present time. Corruptions, it is true, have in past ages contaminated the purity of the Zoroastrian faith; sects have impaired its unity; its national predominance has been repeatedly, and at last finally, overthrown. But its essence has defied time and the malignity of adverse fortune. It has emerged untainted from amidst the ignoble elements thrust upon it; it has, in great measure, outlived the elaborations of ceremony and scruple; it has maintained

* See J. Darmesteter on 'The Supreme God in the Indo-European Mythology,' *Contemporary Review*, October 1879.

its individuality uncompromised, though often menaced, by foreign influences. The creed of the modern Parsi is indeed a narrow and inadequate, if an elevated one. It takes no account of the millennial movements of humanity, or of the unfolding of the designs towards it of God. Such as Zoroaster preached it before the fire-altars of Bactria three thousand years ago, it is virtually held to-day in the very teeth of modern progress, and in defiance of the revolutions which have since then swept over the thoughts of mankind.

The enquiry we have indicated has not failed to allure the learned. From the wide range of prevalent curiosity as to origins, the ancient faith of Iran has not been excluded. Ever since Anquetil Duperron, the first European pupil of the Dasturs of Surat, published in 1771 his imperfect French version of the 'Zend Avesta,' it has formed the subject of animated debate. A mere sample of the industry and erudition employed in its recent progress is furnished by the list of works brought together in the heading of this article. It might be tripled or quadrupled without travelling into any of the bypaths of bibliography. But an assured conclusion seems as remote as when Hermippus asserted Zoroaster's flourishing 5,000 years before the Trojan war, Berosus made him reign at Babylon 2200 B.C., Abul Faraji turned him into an ignominiously dismissed servant of the prophet Elias, or Firdusi sang of his perishing with his fire-priests in the Turanian sack of Balkh.

The issue, indeed, has notably widened with the advance of knowledge. The simple and direct enquiries of former times have been supplemented by more recondite processes of investigation. Philology and archæology, ethnography and comparative mythology, claim each a voice in the matter, no less than—nay, sometimes to the exclusion of—history and tradition. Scientific witnesses seldom agree; and we need not therefore be surprised to find the ground encumbered with a luxuriant growth of irreconcilable opinions. With the discussion of these differences, however, we do not propose to trouble our readers. Our object is to compromise, not to controvert—to collect scattered rays into a distinct image—to put together, with materials borrowed impartially from all quarters, a coherent and, in our judgement, probable narrative of the rise and vicissitudes of the Parsi religion.

It is agreed on all hands that the Indian swarm was the last to leave the parent Aryan hive. Celts, Teutons, Slavs,

Greeks, had all successively set out to encounter their various destinies in the West before the Indo-Iranian residue suffered its ultimate division. This can scarcely have occurred earlier than 2000 B.C. For at the opening of the Vedic period, fixed by the best authorities about 1500 B.C., the Aryan invaders of Hindostan had penetrated very little beyond the Panjâb, and were presumably new arrivals. Their relatives, left behind on the slopes of the Hindu Kush, gradually, after their departure, spread westward as far as Mount Zagros, calling themselves distinctively 'Aryans,' and their new land 'Airan' or 'Iran.'

Up to 2000 B.C., then, Indians and Iranians were one people. They spoke the same language (doubtless with dialectic variations), worshipped the same gods, led the same persistently pastoral or intermittently agricultural life. But the stock of ideas held in common previous to their separation developed, when the Himalayas lay between, after sharply contrasted fashions. On the banks of the Five Rivers the process was one of unshackled evolution—that is, of the unfolding into actuality of what was already present potentially. Among the Bactrian highlands exactly the reverse took place. Thought was not permitted to pursue its own course; it was arrested, turned aside into channels artificially prepared for it, banked in with prescriptions, brought within the domain of moral consciousness. This profound divergence is apparent on the most cursory perusal of the Sacred Books of the two peoples—now happily, through the successful execution of Professor Max Müller's great undertaking, become accessible to English readers. Not so much that deities and devils have exchanged names and functions (though this is significant), as that the views of life represented in those deities and devils are radically different. In the *Avesta** the world is regarded as the arena of a far-reaching and momentous moral combat, in which man takes an active part, and on the issue of which his ultimate happiness depends. Everything is subordinated to this one solemn thought. The Law is designed to discipline the combatants; the Ritual furnishes them with

* The title '*Zend-Avesta*' is really a misnomer. *Avesta* (a cognate term to *Veda*, both being derived from a root *vid*, to know) signifies 'law' or 'revelation,' and properly applies to the ancient texts. *Zend* (from *zan*, to know) means a 'commentary,' and denotes the comparatively late religious treatises written in the transitional form of Persian known as '*Pahlavi*.'

weapons. The beauties and the bounties of nature are scarcely regarded save in so far as they can be enlisted as auxiliaries. The play of fancy, the wealth of imagination, are repressed in the rigid earnestness with which the scheme of salvation is set forth.

In the Vedas all this is changed. They disclose no scheme; they embody a growth. They show the fluctuating outlines, the vivid colouring, of a living and spontaneous production. Nothing is formulated in them; no defined moral or dogmatic purpose underlies them; man's appeals and aspirations, his thrillings of hope and fear, his cravings for immortality and supernal benediction, are flung broadcast on the wide bosom of the Infinite.

Now these singularly contrasted structures are reared upon an identical foundation. They have a large mythical and religious element in common; they everywhere show traces of a primitive agreement both in the conception of the Divinity and in the mode of worshipping it. But primitive agreement has been wrenched into glaring contradiction. Can this be explained? We believe it can. Let us look a little closer.

The 'Avesta' is certainly not the work of any single individual, and was certainly not composed at any one epoch. Moreover, it is easy to pick out the oldest parts of it. These are the five 'Gâthas,' or Hymns (from *gai*, to sing), inserted between the sacrificial prayers of the 'Yasna.' They are written in an antique dialect, closely allied to Vedic Sanskrit, and in a metre similar to the Vedic metres. Hence they are referred by Dr. E. W. West* to the same period (1500-1000 B.C.); while the late Dr. Haug, by whom they were, in 1853, laboriously interpreted, after their meaning had been lost, even to Parsi priests, for 2,000 years, dated them, by a probable conjecture, at 1200 B.C.† Their personification and invocation in the Avestan book known as the 'Vendîdâd' prove that they were already regarded by its compilers as venerable relics of the past. But the Vendîdâd, from its geographical indications, cannot well be placed later than 850 B.C.‡

To the Gâthas, then, we look for the uncontaminated springs of the Zoroastrian faith. Here, if anywhere, we shall come in contact with its essential moving principle.

* Introduction to 3rd ed. of Haug's 'Essays,' p. xlvii.

† Essays, p. 264 (3rd ed.).

‡ See Rawlinson's 'Five Great Monarchies,' vol. iii. p. 107.

What do we find in them? We find the strongest and clearest evidence of a Reform, religious, moral, social. We hear the voice of a preacher of righteousness exhorting his shepherd-hearers to turn from idols to serve 'Ahura Mazda,' the 'all-wise Lord,' the beneficent Creator. Nor was their conversion to be one in profession only. It was to be accompanied by a total change of habits and purposes. Those who accepted 'Mazdeism' were bidden, above all things, to abandon the nomad and predatory life, fruitful only in crime, to cultivate the 'pious' earth, and to embrace 'purity in thought, word, and deed;' thus becoming 'such as to help the life of the future.' There is no reason to doubt that the voice, audible to us out of the grey foretime, was that of Zoroaster or Zarathustra, the founder of the old Persian religion.

The time when he appeared (it can be inferred) was one of social ferment. The more peaceable section of the Iranian population had settled down to agriculture; a turbulent residue drove their flocks from pasture to pasture, harrying and devastating the cultivated lands in their way. These were the idolaters, or 'deva'-worshippers, fulminated by the prophet. Now *deva* means simply a 'bright being.' The term is employed throughout the Vedas, as well as in all later Brahmanical writings, to designate the luminous and atmospheric deities of the Indian Pantheon. In the 'Avesta' it takes the signification 'demon,' and concentrates in itself the idea of all that is abhorrent to man's better nature, and inimical to his happiness. This abrupt reversal of associations gives the key to the diversity of two religious systems so closely related in their origin. The second was a protest against the first. It sprang from it, but by an impulse of antagonism. A legible record of this protest can still be read in the name of the 'Vendî-dâd'—a corruption of *vî-daévô-dâta*, 'given against the 'devas.' And to this day the Parsi confesses his faith to be *vî-daévô*, 'against the devas.'

It is not necessary to suppose, with Haug, that this religious split preceded, if it did not occasion, the fissure of the Indo-Iranian stock. The beliefs which the emigrant tribes carried with them across the Suleiman Passes had doubtless been shared, and were long preserved, by those left behind in the north. The facts that stand out clearly are these: That the Zoroastrian religion originated in a determinate rejection of idolatry; that it was closely connected with a transition from nomad to settled habits; and that it

arose at a period antecedent to the dawns of Persian history, when the central hearth of the future Persian people lay between the Oxus and the Hindu Kush.

The personality of the Reformer has been overlaid and almost obliterated by legendary incrustations. His actual existence even is in dispute. M. Darmesteter, to whom we owe the first translation from the original into English of the greater part of the 'Avesta,'* preceded by a masterly, though somewhat too exclusively directed essay, classes him with Thor, the Vedic Maruts, with Gayômarth, the Avestan first man, and the preacher-bird Karshiptan, as a product of the ubiquitous 'storm-myth.' He smiled, tradition asserts, at birth. Here, evidently to a sworn mythologist, we have the 'laughter of the lightning'—the laughter of Shelley's Cloud, as it 'passes in thunder.'† But, to our thinking, accretions of legend imply, rather than exclude, a solid nucleus of fact. To say nothing of the need of a reformer in order to initiate a reform; or of a certain simple directness of utterance in those Hymns professing, in a special manner, to convey the very words of Zarathustra, by which they are stamped as authentic and individual.

Beyond the reality of his existence, however, and the circumstance of his appeal to a rude community of Bactrian tribes, some predatory and lawless, others harassed and struggling blindly towards a beginning of civilisation, nothing can safely be affirmed concerning him. His father is called 'Pourushaspa,' which is interpreted to signify 'rich in horses.' The name Zarathustra has been variously expounded. Haug considered it to be, not an appellation, but a priestly appellative, like 'Dastur' at the present time, and traced it to the Sanskrit *jarat*, old (in compounds), and *ushtra*, equivalent to *uttara*, superior, excellent.‡ The meaning 'camel,' which also belongs to *ushtra*, forms the basis of an alternative, but even less plausible explanation. An equal uncertainty surrounds the place of the prophet's birth. One account brings him from Ragha in Media to the court of Vishtâsp, king of Bactria, by whose favour the nascent religion emerged from persecutions threatening it with extinction. The reality of such persecutions is attested by many expressions in the Gâthas; but the rest remains obscure.

* Forming vols. v. and xviii. of 'Sacred Books of the East.'

† Introduction, p. lxxviii.

‡ Essays, p. 296.

Less dubious, however, than those of his history are the outlines of his teachings, though here we have to make careful distinctions. Not all that is contained in the 'Avesta' is Zoroastrian doctrine. Some of it represents a backsliding from, much more, a fantastic exaggeration of his principles. We must look to the antique fragments embedded in it to discover what he really inculcated. Here at least there can be no difference of opinion. The creed of the Gâthas is a pure monotheism. They are pervaded by the consciousness of a spiritual Creator, omnipotent, beneficent, moral. The teacher whose words they record sweeps indignantly from before his face—as the angelic messenger to the city of Dis put by the mists of hell—the simulacra of false gods which human ineptitude had raised up to shield purblind human eyes from His brightness. But there are penalties for soaring even towards the truth. The world, as we perceive it, is not all light and harmony. How can the discords, moral and material, which strike our imperfectly attuned ears, be made compatible with a government at once all-powerful and all-good? On the heights of his thought, Zoroaster encountered the formidable problem of the origin of evil. This was how he solved it. Good is the only reality; evil is a non-reality. The two elements are inseparable; they are present everywhere; one is as necessary to existence as the other. Even the mind of the Creator has its good and evil—or, more correctly, its positive and negative—sides; and the light and darkness forming the warp and woof of the web of things are of their respective production. In this sense the world is of dual origin; it is the handiwork of a 'pair of twins'—the Spirit of Increase and the Spirit of Subtraction—acting together under the direction of the Supreme Arbiter. Thus the Bactrian prophet sketched a philosophy as well as founded a religion.

But the wide acceptance of his reform was not secured without some relaxation of its austerity. Its scope was too high, and at the same time too vaguely defined, to be attained completely and at once. The gods it denounced still lived in the hearts of the people, and, as time went on, modestly, yet not inefficaciously, reasserted their claims to worship. Six 'Ameshaspentas,' or archangels, were placed perilously near the throne of Ahura Mazda; Mithra, the impersonation of the light of heaven, Anahita, genius of the waters, Tistrya, a storm-spirit identified with the star Sirius, Haoma, the god-plant, all received honours not

always explicitly subordinated to those paid to their Creator.

A curious incident of this partial relapse was the restoration of the Homa-sacrifice.* This was in use before the Indian migration, and still subsists as one of the leading Brahmanical equally and Parsi rites. From some now unknown plant† was obtained, by expression and fermentation, an intoxicating liquor, to which mystical qualities were ascribed, and in the exhilarating effects of which the gods themselves did not disdain to become partakers. Amid solemn rites, priests and people shared what the 'devas' left unclaimed of the sacred juice, in the sacred fervour whence ensuing, many wild deeds were done. A Homa-sacrifice was, in fact, the usual preliminary, and a potent aid to the success, of a predatory raid. The practice was accordingly reprobated by Zoroaster‡ as the source of some of the most baleful 'spells' of idolatry, and of incalculable evils to the better disposed part of the community. It was not, however, to be thus easily disposed of. It had struck deep root amongst popular memories and superstitions. A compromise was found to be indispensable. The form and supposed virtue were, by Zoroaster's more facile successors, retained; the mischief was abolished. For the heady beverage of former times an innocuous unfermented liquid was substituted, far from provocative of excess. The subterfuge was covered by the invention of a legend (embodied in the 'Homa Yasht') describing an apparition to the Prophet of the genius of the plant, for the purpose of demanding sacrificial honours, thereupon conceded. That they had been previously withheld seems evident from the necessity of such an extraordinary measure on the part of 'Homa 'the golden.'

* *Homa* is the Indian *soma*, the Zend *h* standing for the Sanskrit *s*.

† Its identification would be of much interest, as affording a clue to the exact situation of the hearth of the Aryan nations; but efforts towards it have hitherto proved fruitless. Professor Max Müller ('Academy,' October 25, 1884) suggests the hop, Dr. Watt (cited by Mr. W. T. Thiselton-Dyer, *ib.* December 6), the Afghan grape, to have been the original *soma*. Neither conjecture, however, is quite satisfactory. At present substitutes—generally a kind of *Sarcostemma*, sometimes an *Ephedra*—are employed.

‡ M. de Harlez points out ('Introduction à l'Avesta,' p. clxxxvii) that the rejection of Homa-worship imputed to Zoroaster by Haug and Roth rests on a defective text. There is, however, much circumstantial evidence in its favour.

The rule of life prescribed by the 'Avesta' is regulated by two cardinal principles. The first is that of the dualistic nature of the universe; the second, that of the sanctity of the elements. Both were adumbrated by Zoroaster, but remained strictly subordinate to his intense zeal for the rectification of faith and morals. In the narrower view of the sacerdotal caste to whom it fell to work out his reform in detail, they became of all-absorbing importance, and rigid deductions from them were made an integral (and perhaps the most essential) part of all 'holy living and dying' in the Avestan sense.

The opening chapter of the Vendîdâd shows us Ahura Mazda and Angra-mainyu (Ormazd and Ahriman) in full conflict. Its details run through the whole of Zoroastrian literature. Each 'good creation' has its antitype in a 'bad creation'; hosts of good and evil genii spring into life at the respective words of the combatants; all nature ranges itself in opposite camps; man alone stands erect between the ranks, and chooses his side. It cannot be denied that there is moral elevation in this idea, and in the sincerity and thoroughness with which it is enforced. Moreover, the virtues of truthfulness, fidelity, industry, and beneficence, of faith in a Supreme Being, and repentance for sin, were indispensable to a pious Mazdean. But ceremonial impurity was placed on the same level with moral turpitude; prayer had become a 'fiend-smiting' formula; sacrifice was bartered for favours from, and was more or less explicitly recognised as a proffer of assistance to, the straitened higher powers.

This militant spirit was imported into man's dealings with all living things. 'Ahrimanian' animals were the objects of an implacable religious persecution. The fiends were said to groan when a frog expired. Serpent-slaying was, in point of desert, on a par with the thinning, by so many, of the ranks of the infernal cohorts.* The death of a tortoise expiated all sin in the killer. Flies, lizards, rats, worms, fared no better. Each Mazdean priest was provided with special implements for accumulating merit by their extermination. But the creatures of Ahura Mazda were correspondingly revered. The life of a hedgehog was protected by penalties five times as severe as those exacted for homicide. Assault and battery of a mere fellow-man was a light crime compared with that of supplying a shepherd's dog with scalding porridge

* Darmesteter, 'Ormazd et Ahriman,' p. 284.

or an inconveniently hard bone. A fabulous toll of victims out of the hostile camp—in addition to fines, stripes, oblations, and sacrifices—revenged the slaughter of a water-dog.*

Dirt and demons were no less closely, and far less inoperatively, associated in the early Iranian imagination, than cleanliness with godliness by the popular sapiency of England. Hence the anxious precautions against supposed bodily pollution; the elaborate rubrics and laborious ceremonies for 'purification;' the sedulous seclusion of the 'impure;' the tremendous and inexpiable guilt of the 'false purifier.' Dead and refuse matter offered pre-eminent points of vantage to the members of the host of Ahriman. Even the manner of disposing of nail-parings, and of so-called (in modern hairdressers' parlance) 'combing,' was minutely regulated to prevent their becoming centres of demoniacal influence. But from death itself these radiated irresistibly. Scarcely was life extinguished, when the 'corpse-fiend' (*Drug Nasu*) came from the north in the shape of a fly, and, settling in his place, spread contamination and the danger of further death all round. He could be expelled only by the ceremony (still in use) of the 'Sag-did,' or gaze of a dog, if not four-eyed, then white with yellow ears. But, as both these species were rare, even in the earliest times, much latitude as to the kind available was in practice allowed. In case of need, recourse might also be had to birds of prey, who co-operated with, and eventually superseded, the canine race in the office of consuming human remains. We meet with the 'yellow-eared dog' again (in a late-emerging tradition) on the Bridge of Chinvat, where the fate of departed souls is decided. Here he is obviously a reformed Cerberus, enlisted on the side of virtue; and his relationship to the four-eyed brindled dogs of Yama, first among the dead in the Indian mythology, is still closer.

The dog occupied a unique position in Avestan legislation. His watchfulness over man's visible belongings was thought to be extended to his invisible interests. His presence was the best safeguard against the incursions of the powers of evil. His glance banished fiends. To the sacredness of the living dog corresponded the unclean contagiousness of the dead dog. Alone of the inferior animals,

* Equal to 1,000 ordinary dogs. An otter is generally understood to be the animal indicated.

he shared with man in the supreme pollution of death. Human and canine remains were, in this respect, on a level. The same precautions had to be observed in one case as in the other. Impure animals and unbelievers, on the contrary, became innocuous on the cessation of life.

The most conspicuous practice of Avestan worshippers, as it still is of their Parsi descendants, related to the mode of disposing of the dead. Two sets of ideas met at this point. Horror of effete mortality encountered a pantheistic reverence for the material framework of nature. Fire, earth, water were regarded as semi-divine substances, the necessary use of which was encompassed with the danger of sacrilegious abuse. Sins against elemental sanctity, accordingly, lay heavy on Mazdean consciences, and occupied a prominent place in Mazdean penal legislation. Their guilt culminated in the illegal treatment of the remains of men or dogs. The corpse-burner might be lawfully killed by any orthodox passer-by. Burial of the dead was an inexpiable crime, unless the body were removed within two years. There remained but one expedient—sepulture by carrion-feeding animals. Thus the dark *post-mortem* horror of the Greek became to the Persian the appointed means for chasing the phantasms surrounding decay.

The dualism of the 'Avesta' is not a dualism of equality like that of the Manichæan system. It represents only a temporary struggle, in which the ultimate and absolute victory remains on the side of Light. The resurrection of the dead is an integral part of Avestan theology. Haug considered it to be implied even in the Gâthas. It is clearly stated in later texts. The account of the Persian religion given by Theopompus included the anticipation of a final blessedness, when, on the disappearance of Ahriman, men would neither hunger nor thirst, and like the gods, would cast no shadows.* This agrees perfectly with what we find in mediæval books of commentary,† which gather up the crumbs of Zoroastrian tradition on the subjects of cosmogony and eschatology into a copious, if not too coherent, narrative extending over 12,000 years, from the creation to the end of the world. Fifty-seven years before the final catastrophe (brought about, it would seem, by collision with a comet), Sôshyans, a prophet or saviour, mystically sprung from the

* Plutarch, *Opera* (Reiske), vol. vii. p. 456.

† Notably in the 'Bundahish,' translated by Dr. E. W. West in vol. v. of 'Sacred Books of the East.'

seed of Zoroaster, will appear and devote the interval to 'preparing the dead' for the life which is about to begin. Believers and unbelievers, good and evil, alike quit their tombs, though under different aspects. But their lot is virtually confounded.* By a three days' sojourn in a stream of molten metal, sinners are purified, and join the ranks of the blessed. Then the works of the 'Evil Mind' are annihilated. Mountains sink into a continuous plain; frost and drought, hunger and pain, disease, death, sin, unbelief, are no more. Ahriman vanishes into darkness and impotence, and the light of universal and perpetual happiness dawns upon the world.

The 'Avesta' is not the outcome of a direct advance upon the lines laid down by the prophet. It exhibits many divergences from, and even some partial retrogressions upon them. The main tenet of his doctrine was not preserved intact by those who wielded his authority after him. In various passages of the 'Avesta,' the unity of the godhead is compromised, if not actually surrendered. Ahura Mazda is still the Creator; but he is no longer alone and supreme. His functions and his honours are shared with a multitude of divine beings, to whom he is occasionally represented as offering sacrifice, not merely as an act of succour, but even as a means of impetration.† Moreover, the world which he has made to some extent partakes of his divinity; while the efficacy of his will is impaired by the power of an adversary—controlled, indeed, and eventually to be conquered, but not without much intermediate toil and care. The system of the 'Avesta,' in short, is avowedly dualistic, unconsciously pantheistic, and intermittently polytheistic.

Now, how did the system of the 'Avesta' arise? This is perhaps the most knotty point in the long history of the Persian religion; but our discussion of it must be brief.

The faith of Zoroaster makes its first historical appearance in the arrow-head inscriptions of Behistun, engraved about 516–515 B.C. In them Darius Hystaspes figures as an undoubted disciple of the prophet. From 'Auramazda'

* This doctrine is the prominent one in the 'Bundahish,' but M. de Harlez considers that of everlasting punishment to be implied in the 'Avesta.'

† In the 'Abân Yasht,' Ahura is described as offering sacrifice (the prototype of all future sacrifices) to the genius of the waters, Ardvi Sûra Anâhita, in order to obtain the fidelity to his law of the 'holy 'Zarathustra,' yet unborn. ('Sacred Books,' vol. xxiii. p. 57.)

he acknowledges that he has received his power. To Auramazda he attributes the glory of his victories. Auramazda he exalts as the maker of the world and of man—as the omnipotent ruler of his destinies. ‘Other gods’ are indeed mentioned, but collectively and subordinatedly. They perhaps, in the mind of the writer, hardly transcended the rank of genii or ministering spirits.

But Darius was a Mazdean on other terms than those stipulated in the ‘Avesta.’ If not ignorant of, he was assuredly recalcitrant to, its precepts. The mode of sepulture there insisted on became general in Persia only at a much later date. Darius himself found his last resting-place in a rock-tomb near Persepolis, where his body was carefully preserved. The commoner kind of corpses were interred.* Thus the whole land was contaminated with what, to the religious lawgivers of Bactria, was an abomination and a deadly sin. This point is fundamental. Where interment was in vogue, there the ‘Avesta’ was either unknown or set at naught. Where its authority prevailed, the bodies of the dead were necessarily exposed.

Nothing can be much clearer than that Avestan doctrine came to Persia through Media, and that its propagators were a Median priestly tribe called ‘Magi.’ In the time of Herodotus there were no other ministers of religion in Persia,† and he describes with his usual *naïveté* their characteristic practices of exposing the dead to be torn by birds and dogs, and of piously killing noxious animals. But the mass of the people had not as yet fallen in with their ideas.

The ‘Avesta,’ however, is not (*pace* M. de Harlez) of Median origin. Its language, its legendary contents, the limits of its geographical acquaintance, all point unmistakably to East Iran, or Bactria, as the scene of its growth. This, it is true, involves an apparent inconsistency. Internal evidence stamps it as a Bactrian production, while the first historically discernible propagators of its principles were Median priests. The gap can at present be bridged only conjecturally.

The Medes appear to have taken definitive possession of the country south of the Caspian and east of Mount Zagros

* Having first, according to Herodotus (i. 140), been *secretly* torn by dogs or birds. Possibly he alludes to the custom of the ‘Sag-did,’ doubtless a very old one.

† i. 132.

early in the eighth century B.C. They belonged to the same stock, and issued from the same 'Aryan home,' as the Persians, but brought thence with them a more artificial and deliberately organised form of their common faith. The primitive Persian religion might be described as Zoroastrianism, pure and simple; the Median, as Zoroastrianism *plus* the developments of many sacerdotal generations. That those developments were largely influenced by ideas prevalent amongst a Turanian substratum of the population has been proved by recent epigraphical discoveries in Mesopotamia.* A congeries of closely allied nations, distinguished in Chaldea as 'Accadians,' anticipated by their occupation of a large part of Central and Western Asia the advent of the Aryans and Semites, and silently transmitted to them many of their customs and modes of thought. Towards this tempting branch of our subject, however, we can barely afford to glance. What we are here concerned to point out is that the Persians, when they spread over the tableland of Iran, knew nothing of Medo-Turanian religious innovations, either because those innovations were introduced subsequently to their departure from the Hindu Kush region, or because they were confined to tribes with whom they held little intercourse.

Of the sacred literature transmitted to us, the Persians, we infer, originally possessed only the Gāthas; while Median priests, when they migrated westward, knew besides, by oral transmission, the Vendidad certainly, and probably the nuclear parts of other pieces. Some, no doubt, were either composed or greatly modified at a later date. Now the sacerdotal caste exercised from the first great power in Media. They ruled, when the later sections of the 'Avesta' were written, temporally as well as spiritually, in Ragha.† To them was transferred the veneration paid to the wandering 'fire-priests' of Bactria; they inherited their consecrated language, their antiquarian lore, their rigid traditions, their unswerving puritanism. The Magi, in short, were the legitimate successors and historical representatives of the Avestan 'Athravans.'

In Persia proper, too, they gradually made their way. Introduced as the official ministers of worship by Cyrus, they attempted a political as well as a religious *coup de main* in the elevation to the throne of the false Smerdis. Darius

* See Lenormant's 'Chaldean Magic,' p. 197 *et seq.*

† 'Yasna,' xix. 53 (p. 305 of De Harlez's translation).

Hystaspes gave effect to a national reaction against their overweening authority. The success of his counter-plot was accompanied by a massacre, long commemorated by the popular festival of the 'Magophonia.' They, nevertheless, reinstated themselves under Xerxes and his successors, and became at last completely identified with the religious history of Iran. But their influence, if it did not encourage, was powerless to prevent the steady inroads of corruption. Zoroastrian tenets, however high and pure in their origin, were too loosely framed to hold their own against the insidious approaches of polytheism. On many sides they were open to encroachment. The beginnings of subjugation by the conquered of the conquerors are visible in the adoption from Babylonia of the cuneiform mode of writing, and in the recourse to the emblem of the Assyrian god Asshur to represent Auramazda on the monuments of Behistun and Persepolis. The Babylonian Aphrodite next claimed Persian allegiance. Her cult was formally introduced by Artaxerxes Mnemon, and was the more readily established through her identification with the Iranian goddess of the heavenly waters, Ardvi Sûra Anâhita. Temples and statues were erected in her honour at Ecbatana,* Susa, and Babylon; and the example was quickly followed for other divinities.

But amid such grave degeneracy, and under the forms of a ritual all but avowedly idolatrous, the purer tradition somehow maintained itself. A section of the priests went with the stream, and, finding spiritual teachings no longer savoured, sought influence by practising the occult arts of Chaldea—muttering invocations, divining with rods, pretending even to call down fire from heaven on their sacrilegious altars. The fact of this debasement is recorded in the word *magic*. There were, however, others less prominent, and without doubt less popular, of whom Hermodorus says that they knew nothing of magical divination.† With them the memory of better times lived; it survived the national downfall, struggled on through four centuries and a quarter of hellenising Parthian rule, and was ready to mount the throne with Ardeschîr, son of Babek, first of the Sassanides (226 A.D.)

* M. Halévy has pointed out that a section of the 'Abân Yasht' obviously contains a description of a type of statuary consecrated to this goddess. This particular passage, then, cannot have been written earlier than the 5th century B.C. ('Sacred Books,' vol. xxiii. p. 82.)

† De Harlez, *Intr. à l'Avesta*. p. cxc.

Now, at last, the turn of faithful Mazdeans had come. The Avestan code was made the law of the land. The Magi were admitted as co-administrators of that law. Its penalties were (at least in part) actually enforced; and daily life was, with some success, attempted to be modelled on its rigid prescriptions. Purification according to ritual was enforced by the police. The interment of corpses was punished with death, even when the culprit* was chief minister to the 'king of kings.' The sacred fire was fed with sandal wood and incense on hundreds of altars. Receptacles for the dead, ideally separated from the soil by an encircling golden thread, served as the banqueting-places of innumerable birds of prey. The mutilated Zoroastrian scriptures were collected, reverently studied, diligently commented, and translated out of the antique and almost unintelligible tongue of East Iran into the idiom of mediæval Persia.† Dissent was made penal. Christians were deported, oppressed, or put to death. The heresies of Manes and Mazdak were extinguished in blood.

But the religious unity thus secured was not always even apparent, and was never real. Under a flimsy veil of outward conformity opinions fermented, and speculation was rife. Jewish and Christian influences were profoundly felt; the mystical reveries of Chaldea took form in the sect of the Zervanites; orthodox authority itself was split into the hostile parties called, respectively, 'Mog' and 'Zendik.' Add the peevish discontent engendered by compulsory ceremonial observance, with the disorganisation attendant on civil feuds, and it becomes easily intelligible how the faith and kingdom of Iran fell, a foredoomed and easy prey to Arab fanaticism.

The reign of Yezdegird III., the helpless successor of the conquerors of Valerian and Julian, terminated with the disastrous battle of Nahavand, 642 A.D. His life was still prolonged for ten miserable years. But those who have been great and are unfortunate, find treachery always at their heels. A miller near Merv yielded to the inducements of cupidity, and flung the headless trunk of the last Sassanide into the stream serving to turn his wheel. The act was speedily avenged by a revulsion of popular feeling; but the Persian monarchy was no more.

* Scioces, minister of Khobad. (Procopius, *De Bello Persico*, lib. i. cap. 11.)

† Called 'Pahlavi,' from *Parthia* (the *Parthva* of the cuneiform inscriptions), because it took its rise under Parthian rule.

Evil times ensued. Mohammedan intolerance offered its usual alternative. The vast majority accepted the Koran, but a remnant proved indomitable. Of these, most fled to the deserts of Kernan and Khorassan, carrying with them some fragments of their written law, a lighted brand from their altars, and the no less unextinguished memory of their ancestral traditions. Others found safety in exile. These 'pilgrim fathers of the East' were the progenitors of the flourishing modern community of the Indian Parsis.

A picture of their deserved prosperity has recently been presented, by an eminent member of their body, to the English public. The fact is in itself significant of the progress in European culture and sympathy with European ideas so strikingly manifested in Mr. Dosabhai Framji's pages. To them we gladly refer our readers for details, surprising in their cumulative effect, of the enterprise, liberality, and enlightenment, by which his co-religionists in India have been and are distinguished. The record is in every way a remarkable one; and it has been set forth not only with praiseworthy diligence, but with discretion and good taste, and in pure and fluent English. We gather from the work, of which the title will be found at the head of this article, the following particulars relative to Parsi history.

Just before the close of the century that had witnessed the rise of Mohammed, a band of persecuted Zoroastrians took ship from the island of Hormuz, at the mouth of the Persian Gulf, for Diu, a detached outlier of the peninsula of Gujerat; proceeding thence, in 716, to Sanjan on the mainland of India. They had not forgotten the Avestan maxim, 'He who sows corn sows holiness;' for a piece of waste ground, there assigned them for a settlement, shortly bloomed, by their industry, into a smiling garden. They prospered and multiplied, and in the tenth century sent out vigorous colonies north and south, as far as Cambay and Chaul. It is not to be doubted that reinforcements from Persia reached them from time to time; and 'Guebre'* colonies, certainly of independent origin, abounded in Upper India; but the epoch and manner of their foundation remain uncertain.

At Surat the Parsis first came into contact with Europeans; and European contact was seemingly needed to

* A term of Mohammedan opprobrium, derived from the Arabic *Kafir*, an infidel.

develope their full capabilities. From the first years of the seventeenth century, they monopolised, without seeking to exaggerate, the profits of middlemen between Portuguese, French, Dutch, and English merchants and their native customers. To all parties they seem to have rendered themselves acceptable; to the English, indispensable, since they induced them to follow in their footsteps to Bombay.

The second city of India was then a town of 10,000 inhabitants, dead to European life, and of no special commercial importance. Ceded to the English Crown in 1661 as part of the dower of Catharine of Braganza, it was, seven years later, transferred to the East India Company in consideration of an annual payment of 10*l*. When Fryer visited the place in 1671, the 'rocky woody mountain' called Malabar Hill was already crowned with a Parsi 'Tower of Silence.'* It stands there still in company with five other erections of the same class, the grim abodes, amid a scene of picturesque enchantment, of flocks of inert vultures glutted with human remains.

Of a sum-total of less than 100,000 Zoroastrian worshippers, thinly scattered over various parts of the world, about one-half, or 48,397, were shown by the census of 1881 to reside in Bombay. These are said, not without truth, to form the 'salt of the community.' Their numbers very inadequately represent the influence which they have consistently exerted on the side of civilisation. They are foremost in promoting education; their charity is unbounded and cosmopolitan; they have led the way towards female enfranchisement; they set a bright example of loyalty to the British Crown, and of zeal for all European improvements. The actual prosperity of Bombay is largely due to Parsi enterprise. Until forty years ago, the whole trade of the port passed through their hands. They founded banks and companies; they floated costly undertakings. A Parsi capitalist established, in 1854, the first steam cotton-mill in the 'Manchester of the East.' Parsis were among the first and most successful railway contractors in India; ship-building originated in Bombay with a Parsi of Surat, the founder of the Wadia family; Bombay-built ships owed their reputation entirely to Parsi constructive ingenuity and skilful workmanship. Above all, the commercial morality of this stirring people has always maintained its high standard.

The Parsi millionnaires of a generation or two ago, amongst

* A New Account of East India and Persia, p. 67.

whom Sir Jamshedji Jijibhai was foremost, though far from isolated, derived the bulk of their fortunes from trade with China. Of the new opportunities, however, offered by the Treaty of Nankin in 1842, and by the introduction of steam navigation, Jewish firms both at Bombay and Calcutta were quick to take advantage; and the profits of opium-selling now mainly flow into their coffers. Parsi merchants, too, suffered severely through the 'share mania' ensuing upon the American civil war, so that the fortunes amassed and dispersed by them are no longer on the colossal scale of former days. But *pari passu* with the decline in their prosperity has come a widening in their range of effort. Shaking themselves free from a too exclusive devotion to commerce, they seek distinction in the learned professions and in the service of the State; while agriculture, recommended to them by the strongest religious sanctions, is beginning to attract their capital and energy. And what they do, they do in no grudging spirit, and usually with no partial success.

For a thousand years back the Parsis have used Gujarati, the vernacular of Western India, as their mother-tongue. English is, besides, taught in all their schools; but so much as a smattering of Persian belongs only to the erudite few. The mass of the community repeat customary prayers in a tongue become strange by ages of desuetude, and with no conception of their purport. The recovery of the Zend or Avestan language is an achievement of European philology. Some hold on the meaning of the sacred texts had, indeed, been retained through the Pahlavi version of them; but Zend scholarship had no existence until Eugène Burnouf, in 1833, prepared a scientific foundation for it in his '*Com-mentaire sur le Yaçna*.'

What we possess of Avestan literature is but as salvage from a wreck. According to native tradition, it extended, before the Macedonian conquest, to some two million verses, written with golden ink on prepared cowhides, and divided into twenty-one 'Nasks,' or Books, treating of all the known sciences—astronomy, botany, agriculture, &c.—as well as of religion. This encyclopædia of Persian lore was deposited, it is said, in the archives of Persepolis, and perished with the city in the flames lighted by Alexander's drunken frolic. The story has doubtless a kernel of truth in it. We can gather that the canon of Zoroastrian scripture was then complete, that the whole had been committed to writing, and that much loss attended the troubles of foreign in-

vasion, and the prolonged depression of the ensuing ages of alien rule. So much as was still extant, or could be restored by memory, was collected under the Sassanian king, Shapûr II. (309-380 A.D.). Of 815 original chapters, 348 were then recovered; yet only for a time. A second and less remediable dispersion was brought about by Mohammedan bigotry and ignorance. In Persia itself ages of proscription did their work of ruin effectually. The texts which survived the vicissitudes of exile were only those indispensable to the daily life of the persecuted religion; all the rest went down to final oblivion. One book out of the traditional twenty-one is extant entire. This is the 'Vendidad,' a code of purification and morals of primary importance. The remainder is made up of liturgical pieces, constantly recited, either by the faithful privately, or by the priests in the course of worship. The 'Avesta' transmitted to us thus professes to be, as M. Darmesteter remarks, not a bible, but a prayer-book.

The lead of Europe in the study of these antique documents has been eagerly followed in India. The 'Vendidad,' with some later religious writings, has been translated by learned Parsis into Gujerati; Avestan scholarship is actively encouraged; the fullest investigation and an enlightened interpretation of texts are countenanced. Practical reform has gone hand in hand with critical enquiry. The prevalent ignorance of an hereditary priesthood has been to some extent dissipated; abuses, tending to the depravation of morals, have been remedied; domestic life has been, amongst the progressive class, remodelled after the English pattern; superstitious observances, borrowed from the Hindus, and grown inviolable by long use, have been exposed as to their origin, and denounced as to their practice. Everywhere intelligent innovation is at work.

The question arises, how far will it go? Will it lead on to Christianity, or will it stop short with the rationalisation of a more ancient faith? The answer is not doubtful. Our wishes cannot blind us to the fact that to the highest truth this remarkable people seem, for the present, inaccessible. They neither admit, nor, with the rarest exceptions, afford converts. The door of their religion may be said to be closed, whether for entrance or exit. Susceptibility to external impressions has been at all times singularly combined in them with tenacity in holding on to fundamental beliefs. Their religious history has accordingly never lost continuity, while exhibiting the utmost variety of elevating

or corrupting influences cast as transient reflections on the one invariable prehistoric background.

With the Parsi creed, as expounded by Mr. Dosabhai Framji, it is probable that Zoroaster himself, could he rise from his sleep of three thousand years, would find himself in substantial agreement. It is a pure monotheism. The polytheistic excrescences of the 'Avesta' have lost vitality and dropped off through contact with Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism; its latent pantheism has remained in comparative abeyance; its dualism has returned to its original position as a defective philosophy of evil. Of fire-worship, in an idolatrous sense, the Parsis are altogether innocent. The accusation is a calunmy, which can only be repeated through wilful malice or culpable ignorance. Zoroaster adopted the old Aryan fire-cult, making that beneficent element and chief instrument of civilisation not an object, but a centre of worship. The Parsis do likewise. The purified flame burning in their temples is to them a symbol of the Divinity, and an aid to the lifting up of thought. It is, indeed, perhaps unconsciously to themselves, something more. There is a strong savour of antique naturalism in their reverence for the so-called 'elements.' But this is a survival of primeval ways of thinking, rather than a part of their religion.

The distinctive practices of Parsis are, with one striking exception, negative or unobtrusive. They never smoke; they will not voluntarily extinguish fire; the use of public baths is abhorrent to them. They esteem it a sin to speak while eating, to touch the ground with bare feet, to pollute fire or water. No Parsi could contemplate without a pious shudder the end of Hafed, Moore's Guebre chief, who, by a singular infelicity of the poet's invention, concentrates in one brief moment, and that his last, three of the most heinous crimes of which a Zoroastrian could be guilty—suicide, corpse-burning, and defilement of a consecrated flame.

The wearing of the *kusti*, or sacred girdle, is the special badge of the Zoroastrian faith. It is a woollen cord, woven of seventy-two threads, typical of the seventy-two chapters of the 'Yasna,' passed three times round the waist to recall the triple moral obligation as to thoughts, words, and deeds, and fastened with four knots, one in honour of each of the elements. A short form of prayer accompanies its removal and replacement, and the ceremony of investiture with it, performed equally for boys and girls at the age of seven, is

held to imply irrevocable consecration to the Zoroastrian profession. Its correspondence with the 'sacred thread' of the Brahmans vindicates for it an immemorial antiquity.

In their treatment of the dead, however, the Parsis stand abruptly aloof from all other peoples who have risen above the lowest grades of barbarism. There is no reason to suppose that a practice so shocking to our ideas—or prejudices—was enjoined by their prophet. The very name, *dakhma*, of the erections serving as its scenes, bears authentic witness, by its derivation,* to the prevalence among the early Iranians, as among the modern Hindus, of the custom of cremation. But exposure was, Cicero tells us,† a known Hyrcanian usage, and it still survives amongst the 'Kafirs' of the Hindu Kush. We can infer that, as their scruples regarding elemental desecration developed and grew formidable, the 'Athravans,' by whom Zoroastrianism was moulded into its eventual shape, borrowed the expedient from the savage tribes of the surrounding deserts, and gradually and with difficulty forced it on their reluctant disciples.‡ That it is, however, capable of a plausible defence, not only on sanitary, but even on sentimental grounds, will be discovered by an impartial survey of Mr. Dosabhai Framji's arguments in its favour.§

The lot of those faithful Mazdeans who elected to endure persecution in their own country, rather than encounter the hardships, for the sake of the tranquillity to be found in exile, has proved one of relentless oppression. Its few and late alleviations have been derived from the disinterested exertions of their co-religionists in India and England. As the result of a quarter of a century's indefatigable memorialising and petitioning, they obtained from the Shah's Government through British intervention, in August 1882, the repeal of the odious *jazia*, or poll-tax, the occasion of untold sufferings to the Zoroastrians of Persia. In attempts to raise them from the slough of despond into which they have been sunk by twelve centuries of proscription, Parsi material resources, no less than moral influence, have been freely spent. But a permanently prosperous issue for these is probably beyond hope. Each successive revolution in Persia

* From *daz*, Sanskrit *dak*, to burn (Geiger, 'Ostiranische Kultur,' p. 268).

† Tusc. Quæst. lib. i. cap. 45.

‡ This, in the main, is Geiger's view, *op. cit.* p. 267.

§ Hist. of the Parsis, vol. i. p. 206.

has served but to aggravate the destiny of the contemned Guebres: each newly-fledged conqueror has signalised his triumph with a fresh effort for their extermination. From 100,000 a century ago, their numbers have dwindled, under constantly renewed penal pressure, to between 7,000 and 8,000. These are collected, with the exception of insignificant groups at Kerman and Ispahan, at Yezd, the mid-point of the caravan-route across the Kermanian desert. Isolated in the midst of a hostile population, they preserve, with unflinching constancy, their antique customs and beliefs, yet with no bright outlook; the dejection of proximate extinction covers them. The life of the future is not with them. What promise it holds for their race and creed has passed from the perishing remnant to its vigorous offshoot in the Indian peninsula.

ART. IV.—*Frédéric II et Louis XV, d'après des documents nouveaux.* 1742-1744. Par le Duc DE BROGLIE. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris: 1885.

WHEN two years ago we closed our review of the Duke de Broglie's 'Frederic II. and Maria Theresa,' we expressed a hope that we might shortly be able to resume our labours. That wish has been gratified. We have now the second part of this interesting history, which is, we may say at once, a worthy sequel to its charming predecessor. It is another book of a grand prose poem; another set of scenes in the succession of noble pictures, which, in a clearer, brighter light, bring before us once again the great European drama of the middle of last century. It has indeed been objected to the Duke de Broglie that his colouring is too exclusively French; and that Frederic was, after all, not so black as he is painted. This is a convenient form of criticism: it involves no examination, nor any exercise of argument or memory: a statement must be false, a description overcharged, which represents that great hero as a man, great indeed, great in intellect, great in genius, but still greater in crime. With such views, we are here in no way concerned. To us, an historical statement is true or false, not because it agrees with or runs counter to our prejudices, but because it is or is not supported by a body of evidence which would be held sufficient in any civilised court of justice, or in regulating the daily affairs of life. Without such evidence, no man can be convicted of crimes laid to his

charge, even if we cannot always feel that he must, in its absence, be entitled to an acquittal; and it is because we find in the Duke de Broglie's works the careful investigations of the judge, rather than the plausible address of the advocate, that we assign to him a very high place amongst modern historical writers.

There are, of course, questions in which the author's nationality necessarily gives a certain bias to his opinions. No human being can consider with the same impartiality the crimes of which he is the victim, and the crimes by which other people have suffered. The comparative harmlessness of killing a mandarin is an old fable, but as true to nature now as it was a hundred years ago; and an Englishman, a Frenchman, or a German necessarily takes a different view of transactions which shook France to its very base, and laid the foundation of the modern empire of Prussia. But the historian who honestly and intelligently examines the evidence of all parties cannot go very far wrong; and this M. de Broglie has done. In that sense, his account is neither French, nor Prussian, nor Austrian, nor English; but is framed on a full knowledge and critical judgement of the original and genuine sources of information in each one of the countries. In this, we are happy to notice that a remark which we formerly made has borne abundant fruit, for the correspondence of the English ministers at Vienna or Berlin is no longer filtered through the blundering inaccuracy of Raumer, or the malignant travesty of Carlyle, but comes to us direct from the original documents in the Public Record Office, as to the correctness of the references to which we are in a position to bear testimony.

We will, however, add one criticism, and not an unimportant one. There is, throughout, a lamentable want of dates. This is the more felt, as the chronological sequence of events is not always adhered to, and it is sometimes difficult to tell how far the inference of cause and effect is fully warranted. In some cases again, sentences of different letters are dovetailed together, without any indication that they are not of the same date; as an extreme case of which, we may refer to tom. ii. p. 327, where two letters from the King of Prussia to Marshal Noailles are quoted together, the one being of July 12, the other of August 9, 1744. A reference to the '*Politische Correspondenz*' does indeed check any misunderstanding; but the ordinary reader has not the '*Politische Correspondenz*' at his side, and prefers having the story complete in itself. We would also, though

with but faint hopes of doing any good, enter a protest against the persistent mis-spelling of foreign names. The English, indeed, fare better than usual; but the names of distinguished Germans are frequently distorted almost out of recognition. We know that this is French custom; but we submit that the custom is a bad one, and that a writer of the calibre of the Duke de Broglie might very well have the moral courage to trample it under foot.

The peace which Frederic had hastily concluded at Breslau, June 11, 1742, left the French army in Bohemia in a position of extreme danger. It was in want and distress; its numbers had dwindled down from 40,000 to 25,000; and it might any day be shut up in Prague by the whole might of Austria. The Queen of Hungary had exact information of its condition, and was resolved that by it, if in no other way, some expiation should be made for the crime by which she had suffered. The Count de Belle-Isle, commanding at Prague, sent to propose an interview with the Grand-Duke. The queen indignantly refused it. 'If his object is to offer 'a capitulation,' she said, 'the most junior officer in the 'army is able to receive it.' It was with difficulty that she could be persuaded to authorise Marshal Königsegg to meet the French general; and when she at last yielded, it was with the words: 'If it must be, it must; but understand 'that I will not sanction any weakness.' A negotiation so begun was doomed beforehand to failure. Königsegg had no powers; and he, as well as all other Austrians, looked on Belle-Isle as the main author of all the troubles. There was thus scant courtesy, and the conversation would seem to have been of the most formal kind. Belle-Isle offered to withdraw from Bohemia if the Austrians would, at the same time, *pari passu*, withdraw from Bavaria. Königsegg would agree to nothing, would say nothing, except that if the French wished for peace they must begin by evacuating Bohemia. To this, Belle-Isle would not, indeed could not, consent; and so the meeting ended, without result.

Fleury, from Paris, then took up the business. Belle-Isle had mentioned in his despatch that Königsegg had referred to the cardinal and their former acquaintance, in terms of civility; and Fleury, making this an opportunity, wrote to the Austrian a letter, possibly the most abject that the minister of an independent state ever wrote, even to a victorious enemy. He expressed the pain it gave him to learn that he was considered to be the author of the existing

troubles in Germany; his excellency must surely know who it really was that had determined the king to enter on a course so contrary to what he, the cardinal, would have wished. The consequences of war were terrible, and were to be deprecated. It was indeed only just that some sacrifice should be demanded from France; but he trusted the Austrians would remember the uncertainty of human affairs: humanity, religion, and policy should prevent them from claiming all the advantages which they might think their due. No direct notice was taken by Königsegg of this astounding letter. He would seem to have forwarded it to the queen, to whom, at the same time, Fleury had also sent a more direct communication through the intermediacy of the Marquis de Stainville, the minister of Tuscany.

The queen was already in a state of extreme fury, bordering on frenzy. Her advisers were anxious that she should accept her fortune and come to terms with her enemies. 'If I give up something to each of them,' she said, 'what will remain for myself? Do you want me, of my own accord, to establish the preponderance of Sardinia in Italy, and of Prussia in Germany?' She had been compelled to cede Silesia; she absolutely refused to restore Bavaria unless she got some other compensation. The French were hers; they should lay down their arms and become prisoners of war. In vain it was represented to her that there were many possibilities open to 25,000 men with arms in their hands. She would hear of nothing but unconditional surrender. As to Fleury, she answered him through Stainville in a letter of vehement denunciation and withering scorn. So long, she said, as he could think he was able to grind Austria into dust, there was not a word of these mild and pacific sentiments; as his hope of success disappeared, the face of things changed. At his bidding, and regardless of the most solemn treaties and guarantees, her territory had been invaded, the constitution of the empire overthrown, the liberty of Germany trodden down. If he could have had his way, the House of Austria would have been wiped out, and he would have dictated laws under the walls of Vienna. She would not now have any plastered-up peace. Her own views were as moderate and pacific as they always had been; but it was just and indispensable that the wrong that had been done her should be atoned for, and that she should be secured against similar enterprises in future. At the same time that she wrote thus to the cardinal himself, she held him up as the butt for the ridicule and contempt

of Europe by forwarding his letter to Königsegg to the 'Gazette de Hollande,' in which it was promptly published at full length.

The insult accomplished what neither prudence nor patriotism could do. It stung Fleury into courage and a determination to act with vigour for the release of the army of Bohemia. But the delay, the neglect, the hoping for something to turn up, had been carried too far, and the position of affairs was well nigh desperate. The Count de Saxe was ordered to take command of the army on the Danube, and to effect a junction with Belle-Isle. He was obliged to report that the numbers were too small, and the state of the troops too bad, to offer any prospect of success in the face of the Austrian forces, united under Prince Charles and Marshal Khevenhüller. No other course seemed left except to order eastwards the army which, under the Marshal de Maillebois, had been stationed in Westphalia as a check on the Dutch or the English.

The advisability of moving this force towards Bohemia had already been seriously debated. For a whole year it had had nothing to do, for neither Dutch nor English had made any move; but it seemed now not improbable that the change of ministry in England, and the pressure which the new Government was bringing to bear on the States-General, might forebode some active measures, in face of which it would be in the highest degree imprudent to leave the north-east of France unprotected. The days of Marlborough were not so far removed; the memory of Blenheim, of Ramillies, of bodies of the enemy advancing even to within sight of Versailles, was still too keen. The question was referred to a committee of the three senior marshals then in Paris—Puységur, Asfeld, and Noailles. Puységur was eighty-four years of age; Asfeld was seventy-eight: it is not to be wondered at, their counsels were cautious and timid. 'We ought not,' said Puységur, 'to risk all the resources of France and leave her quite naked. But with what is left in the north-eastern provinces we could not raise an army of 20,000 men. The first necessity is to render "Old France" secure from the incursions or enterprises of the enemy.' Noailles, who was many years younger, took a more adventurous view.

'The danger' (he said) 'is more pressing in Germany than in France, and the reaction of a check in Germany would be disastrous, even at home. The only real difficulty is in the possible perfidy of the King of Prussia, which may lead him so far as to add his troops to

those of the Queen of Hungary, in order to overwhelm ours. It is a thing no one can answer for, but which ought not to prevent our doing what we can for the safety of the two armies.'

The queen's letter brought the discussion to a crisis. In the council, opinions were divided; and Fleury was still hesitating, when, for probably the first time, the king took a decided part. 'Are you ready to supply whatever may be 'wanted?' he asked the Controller-General. 'Sire,' was the answer, 'I will supply everything which your majesty 'may think fitting to order.' 'Well, then,' replied the king, 'I desire that M. de Maillebois march on Bohemia.' The friends of the rival marshals, Belle-Isle and Broglie, were equally rejoiced at the determination; but, nevertheless, the king's action puzzled everybody. Speculation was busy as to the source of his unwonted energy; and failing any other solution, people began to hope that it was, in truth, a first symptom of his emerging from the lethargy in which he had so long been plunged, and that Fleury's reign was at an end. A few days were sufficient to falsify all such hopes, and to show that Louis had postponed any intentions of independence which he might have formed. Disappointment gave a new sting to the wits of the court, who ridiculed the idea of the two cardinals, Fleury and his coadjutor Tencin, directing operations of war, by comparing the army of Maillebois to a party of Maturins, a religious order specially devoted to the relief of Algerine prisoners.

In Germany the promptitude of the action at once excited attention not altogether free from surprise, for it had come to be understood that nothing energetic was to be expected from Fleury, who in presence of danger was almost imbecile. The King of Prussia complimented Valori, the French ambassador, on the change, though seeming doubtful of its permanence. Valori said something about the necessity of prudence, so as not to compromise the last resource of France. 'Ah! my friend,' answered Frederic, 'you have 'shown quite enough prudence: you may perhaps find it 'better if you now try a little vigour.' The emperor was overjoyed; he pictured to himself the triumph of the French arms and his own speedy return to Bavaria. The Queen of Hungary, too, was pleased; the news that the last available French army was wandering away into the distant parts of Germany seemed to her the promise of the downfall of France. She had, therefore, no care to oppose their march. Before they could get far enough to interfere with her plans in Bohemia and Bavaria, they would be called back to

defend France against the combined forces of England, Holland, and the Austrian Netherlands; the further, therefore, they had advanced, the more certain would be the ruin of their country. And thus, without any difficulty or obstruction, Maillebois advanced as far as Egra.

In the meantime the French in Prague were a prey not only to the sufferings incidental to the state of siege in which they were living, but to the violent quarrels between their generals, in whom the difficulties of their position had given new force to the old rancour. The superior officers, who, for the most part, owed their appointments to Belle-Isle, were passively hostile to Broglie, obeying him indeed, but without enthusiasm; and the whole army was in the tottering condition of a house divided against itself. On the night of September 13 they were, however, surprised by the Austrians suddenly breaking up their camp. The following day they had news that Maillebois had arrived at Amberg, where he expected to be joined by Saxe. The Austrians, whose hope of the action of the allies in the west had come to nothing, were thus under the necessity of raising the siege, and turning to meet their new enemy; and so, for two or three weeks, the armies lay opposed to each other, neither venturing to attack. And yet, with equal forces in front and the army of Prague in rear of the Austrians, the French might have placed them in a position of great difficulty, could they have acted with a little of that vigour which Frederic had accused them of wanting. Of this the Austrian generals were quite sensible, and made urgent representations to the Grand Duke, who referred the matter to a council of war. Generals, Grand Duke, council of war, and public opinion, were unanimous in favour of treating; but the queen was resolute; she would make no terms. The French had invaded Germany; so far as lay in her power, they should pay the penalty. She forbade all negotiation with their leaders; in case any should be attempted, she disavowed it in anticipation. On the other hand, Fleury's burst of energy had speedily died out; he was alarmed at the possible consequences of what he had done; afraid lest even a victory over the Austrians should call the more particular attention of the English and Dutch to the nakedness of the French frontier; and thus, all the letters which Maillebois received inculcated caution. He was told that the object was not to win a battle, but, by wisdom and prudence, to succeed in bringing back the beleaguered force; and, as the Austrians

barred the way, it did not appear how the object was to be attained.

It was at length suggested by Saxe that a junction between the two armies might be effected at Leitmeritz, a position due north of Prague, which, it was estimated, might be reached from Egra in a fortnight's march. It was soon found that over bad roads, in the rainy season, the progress was extremely slow. The peasants, too, were hostile; they would render no assistance, and when impressed took the first opportunity to desert with their horses, and to carry such news as they had to the Austrians, who were thus kept well informed of the French positions, were able to cut off their scouting parties and their stragglers, and, without risking any serious encounter, to harass them by continual ambuscades and skirmishes. At the end of the first week they had barely done one-third of the distance; a great part of their provisions had been spoiled by the wet; the country afforded nothing; men and horses were already on half rations, and the conviction forced itself on them that to struggle on any further would but insure their utter ruin. The order was therefore given to return. A week later, Maillebois re-entered Egra with the weak and exhausted remains of his army, which could scarcely have made a worse appearance had it sustained an overwhelming defeat. It was evident that nothing more could be done for the relief of Prague, and as, in the absence of the Austrians, the imperial forces had regained Munich, Maillebois determined to move towards the Danube, and endeavour to maintain at least that advantage.

The news of the retreat to Egra and of the abandonment of Prague was received in Paris with howls of indignation. Insult, opprobrium, and ridicule were showered on the name of Maillebois, and orders were sent to Broglie to leave Belle-Isle at Prague, and take on himself the command of the army which was on its way to the Danube. Directly or indirectly, even by threatening Vienna, he was to do his utmost to release the garrison of Prague; whilst, in case of failure, full power was given to Belle-Isle to adopt any means he chose, short of the capitulation which Maria Theresa demanded. In accordance with these orders, Marshal de Broglie left Prague in the last days of October, and, though not without much difficulty, made his way to Dresden and even Leipzig; thence, southwards, keeping out of reach of the Austrians, till, towards the middle of November, he joined and superseded Maillebois in Bavaria. He found his

new command as disheartened and disorganised as that which he had left at Prague. Discipline, always lax, had given way altogether. Desertions were numerous, even amongst the officers. 'For a man to love his native land,' wrote one of their generals, 'has hitherto been considered a virtue; in this army, it is a detestable vice.' To restore order and discipline was Broglie's first care; but he had little time; for, in obedience to the queen's imperious commands, Prince Charles was in front of him, and bent on active hostilities. To maintain himself in Bavaria was the utmost Broglie could do; to relieve or release Belle-Isle was out of the question, as at length, on December 21, he wrote to him, in cold and measured language. The letter, however, was unavailing; for, before it was even written, Belle-Isle, having convinced himself that he had nothing to expect from Broglie, and in consideration of the state of his garrison, which every day rendered worse, had resolved to force his way out. And accordingly, leaving behind him all the sick and invalids, he had quitted Prague, in the early morning of December 19, with 15,000 men of all arms.

The weather was intensely cold; but after six days of hardship and terrible suffering, of forced marches, and of frequent skirmishes, he arrived at Egra on Christmas Day. The story of this memorable retreat has been often told, and in fuller detail, though not with more life than here, by the Duke de Broglie; but the history of the plan on which it was conducted is, we believe, now related for the first time. The Chevalier Folard, a retired officer, well known by his writings on military history and tactics, and especially by his voluminous commentary on Polybius, wrote to Belle-Isle two letters (November 2 and 11), in which, assuming the necessity of abandoning Prague, he traced out in complete detail a scheme for the order of march, 'suggested,' he said, 'by lessons deduced from the retreat of Xenophon's ten thousand.'

'The letters' (says the Duke de Broglie) 'arrived at their address, and, which is curious, though Belle-Isle never spoke of them, either then, or afterwards in his memoirs, he did not throw them disdainfully on one side, but carefully studied them, and followed their directions almost literally. Nearly all the arrangements, the detail of which he has himself complacently described in his reports, are exactly those which this student of tactics had pointed out to him, with only some slight modifications rendered necessary by the peculiarities of the ground.'

And Folard's indications were not by word only, but were illustrated by a sketch, showing the arrangements of the

columns, cavalry, artillery, baggage, the whole of which is almost identically repeated and described by Belle-Isle in his official report of what was actually done. 'It has, I think, seldom happened,' continues M. de Broglie, 'that theory, working at a distance and with data so uncertain, has acted as such an exact guide to practice.'

The losses sustained on the retreat were extremely heavy. The numbers do not seem to have been ever accurately known. Belle-Isle, in his despatches, estimated them as not more than 1,000 or 1,100. This was certainly far below the reality, which, what with killed, dead of cold or died of its effects, and some 800 taken prisoners, cannot have been much less than one-fifth of the total number that left Prague. All the baggage, too, was lost, but not a single gun; and, in summing up the narrative, the Duke de Broglie proudly adds, 'The honour of the army was saved.' 'It has not always been so,' is his sad reflection, as he continues:—

'If amongst those who read these pages there should be some who in our last war experienced the pain of a siege, endured without hope, and ended by a capitulation without conditions; if there are any who were conveyed, disarmed and prisoners, to the frozen banks of the Elbe or the Oder, they, I am sure, will esteem that army fortunate which found a general determined to preserve it, at whatever cost, from the worst insults of fortune. In memory of what they themselves suffered, they will once more accord justice, if not gratitude, to the manly resolution which then saved the honour of the French arms. It may be that such a reference is contrary to the strict rules of historical writing. But there are situations whose force is overpowering, and comparisons involuntarily occur to the pen of the writer, as to the mind of the reader; and in studying the details of the siege of Prague, and examining the tiny letters written in minute characters on the thinnest of paper, such as in our own time we have seen bringing messages of hope or of mourning from Metz or Paris, we feel that, in spite of what is claimed as the effect of the Revolution, the history of the past is closely bound up with the history of the present, and that an indissoluble bond connects the different generations of the same people. 'Tis vain and impious to speak, as do some narrow-minded sectaries, of an old France and a new France, and pretend to exalt the one by debasing the other. A great nation is an endeared and glorious being, whose life stretches back through centuries; and in the past, as in the present, all that tells of its greatness or its glory, of its affliction or its sorrow, equally touches the heart-strings of its true children.'

Belle-Isle had unquestionably rendered an important and critical service to France, and his reward was a letter, coldly thanking him, and directing him, after sending all the effective soldiers to join Marshal de Broglie, to return home

with the invalids. The explanation was that Belle-Isle's friends were no longer in power. Whilst Fleury was slowly dying there had been something equivalent to what we should now call a 'ministerial crisis,' but which the Duke de Broglie happily styles a 'revolution in the seraglio.' Madame de Mailly had been superseded by her more ambitious sister, Madame de Tournelle. Of the king's share in this revolution it is unnecessary to speak at any length. He had long been weary of the society of Madame de Mailly, and had appeared struck by the charms of Madame de Tournelle; but lethargic even in his vices, he was incapable of the exertion necessary for throwing off the yoke which galled, or for winning the prize which allured him. Louis XV. is known in history as pre-eminently a sensualist. It is, perhaps, a false view to take of his character, the ruling power in which seems rather to have been sloth. He would scarcely have taken the trouble even to be vicious; and so far, the blame of his life is primarily due to those who, for their own selfish ends, plunged him into a slough of bestial indulgence.

It is thus that the changes of the royal favourites have a political importance, which causes the Duke de Broglie to devote many pages to the history of the intrigue by which the Duke de Richelieu raised Madame de Tournelle to favour and to power. It is sufficient for our present purpose to indicate the circumstance, the effects of which were to advance the interest of Noailles and Richelieu, kinsmen and friends of the new favourite. And giving them such credit as is due, the influence of Madame de Tournelle was probably the best, the most wholesome, to which Louis was ever subject. Neither sensuality nor greed was her ruling passion; she was ambitious; and she lent herself readily to the plans of her two advisers, who wished to induce the king to be his own minister. It is thus that M. de Broglie describes the early days of her reign:—

'She asked nothing, either for or against any one; but when the king spoke to her of love, she answered by speaking of his glory and of France, which was eagerly expecting him to give the signal to call her to action. Language such as this, in the mouth of a woman he loved, exercised a new and flattering charm, and kindled in the breast of the sovereign some sparks of a manliness which had slumbered too long. At times, however, he was impatient that politics should thus invade the hours which he proposed to dedicate to pleasure. "Do you know how she treats me?" he said to the Duchess de Brancas. "She will have nothing to do with mere personal matters, which she thinks unworthy of her; but of the government, of peace, of war,

"she will never have done talking. That worries me. I have frequently told her that she was killing me, and what do you think she said? 'So much the better, sire; we have need of a royal resurrection.'"

The good people of Paris were not unwilling to condone the domestic vices of Madame de Tournelle, created Duchess de Châteauroux, for her political virtues; and in their eager hope that their king might become a king worthy of France, offered to his mistress their homage in terms almost respectful, in language enthusiastic and almost poetic. It may thus be fairly counted to the credit of Madame de Châteauroux that when Cardinal Fleury died, January 29, 1743, the king did undertake the duties and drudgery of the ministry, and for some days presided at the Council, worked with the secretaries of state, and even addressed a circular letter to all the ministers abroad, ordering them to correspond directly with himself, as had been the custom in the reign of Louis XIV. 'Every hour,' wrote Argenson in his journal, 'the king's reputation is rising, and will soon be as high as that of Henri IV.' Others held the same language; but Chambrier, the Prussian ambassador, wrote to Frederic, 'There are still some who think that the king's design is above his strength, because he is too late in beginning, and an antagonistic course of life has taken too deep root.' 'And the most thoughtful,' adds M. de Broglie, 'probably considered that those resolutions only are durable which are spontaneous, and that this weak prince had never shown less real independence than at the very time when he was assuming all the airs of command.' It was just at this time that Belle-Isle returned to France and made his appearance at court; but, as though with a tender solicitude for his health, the king advised him to rest himself in the country. For the time being, his career was closed.

Meanwhile, France was heartily sick of the German war. On his way home Belle-Isle, in accordance with instructions most distasteful to him, had visited the emperor at Frankfort, and had explained to him the necessity of making peace on such terms as the Queen of Hungary would grant; that France, at any rate, could not and would not have anything more to do with a war which she had entered into only as an ally of Prussia, but the whole burden of which she now seemed expected to bear; the French troops must and should be withdrawn as soon as possible, if only to protect the boundaries or even the territory of France, which the English and Dutch seemed likely to threaten. In vain

the emperor protested. The only course remaining for him was to open negotiations. England was ready to welcome and to second his overtures. The war in Germany was always a danger to Hanover and an embarrassment to herself. If that could be stopped, a coalition against France became possible; or even without one, Austria would be better able to devote herself to resist the aggression of Spain in Italy, where any blow to the House of Bourbon would strengthen England's maritime interests.

One power, however, and that the most important, was firmly opposed to the peace on any terms which the emperor would or could offer. The Queen of Hungary, who had been despoiled of Silesia, held a great part of Bavaria by force of arms as an equivalent; nor would she listen to any proposal to give it up, short of the active assistance of the emperor against France. The cession of Lorraine, she asserted, had been fraudulently obtained; Alsace had been violently reft from the empire. If, with the aid of the emperor, she could recover these provinces, she might agree to evacuate Bavaria; otherwise she would keep what she had. In this she was determined, and, as has often happened, the determination of one resolute person, and that person a woman, swayed the wishes and actions of her weaker-minded confederates. England and Holland yielded to her passionate sense of injury, and undertook to send an army to her support and in defence of her righteous cause. This so-called Pragmatic army, under the command of the King of England in person, was to march across Germany from the Palatinate to Bavaria, where the French army under Broglie must be inevitably caught between it on the west, and the Austrians, under Prince Charles on the east, and under Lobkowitz on the north. The French were not slow to realise the possibilities which environed them, and raised a large force under the command of Noailles to obstruct the passage of the allies. The scene of the impending war was shifted, but the political sky of the early season of 1743 was as blood-red as those of previous years.

It was, however, with very little satisfaction that Frederic saw the new phase which the war was assuming. He had flattered himself that, on his retiring from the struggle, France and Austria would continue it on equal terms, till, both being exhausted, he would be left arbiter of the destinies of Germany and of Europe. Things had not turned out quite as he had meant them, the contest had not been so equal as he had expected. France was, indeed, threatened

with exhaustion, but Austria was daily growing stronger, and this interference of England promised to render her the dominant power. It occurred to him as far from impossible that after the Queen of Hungary had crushed France and the emperor, she might even turn against him, and at once vent her rage and win back her Silesia. He learned, too, that one of the proposed conditions of peace was the appointment of the Grand Duke as King of the Romans. This would terribly contravene his plans. As a Protestant, he could not himself aspire to the imperial throne; the next best thing was to have it occupied by a nonentity like the Elector of Bavaria. 'He will have all the trouble, I shall have all the authority,' he had said before the last election. But if it was now to fall back to the House of Austria, his advantage was done away with. Every way his position was difficult, on no side could he see the gain which was to accrue to himself. At an early date, he had tried Lord Hyndford, the English ambassador, with insolence and blustering. He demanded to know the intention of the King of England with regard to the march of the troops.

'If the king,' he said, 'intended to attack France either in Flanders, Lorraine, or in any other country that belonged to France, he had nothing to say; but it was his duty, as the most considerable prince of the empire, to prevent any further confusions, "et s'il faut dégainer, il vaut mieux aujourd'hui que demain." "I believe," wrote Hyndford, "that he is himself so much afraid of *dégainer*, that he only makes use of such expressions as he is conscious to himself would have their effect upon himself which he will hope they may have upon others.'"

A few days afterwards he returned to the charge. On December 20, Hyndford again wrote:—

'The King of Prussia, after supper and, I suppose, a good deal of wine, took me aside and said: "My lord, I hear the English troops march, and towards the Rhine. If that is the case, I must tell you plainly that they will have to do with me, for I will not suffer foreign troops to enter the empire to trouble its repose. They may make war against France in Lorraine or anywhere else; but if they pass the Rhine, I shall be obliged to oppose myself to them, and all the princes of the empire will do the same.'"

Notwithstanding Mr. Carlyle's continual sneers at Hyndford as a Scotchman with an 'edacious countenance,' his conduct in this very difficult position seems to have been

marked by judgement and tact. On December 22, he wrote:—

‘Yesterday, I went to Count Podewils to expostulate with him upon the unaccountable discourse the king had held to me the night before. After I had recapitulated the whole of it, the count, shrugging up his shoulders with an air of surprise and pity, said: “I wish to God the king would not enter into conferences with foreign ministers upon public affairs, or that he would entirely take matters upon himself; for,” added he, “I am sick of it.” He then asked me if it was before or after supper. I answered, “After supper.” He repeated, “He must have been in wine.” I then said that the execution of threatenings that kings made when heated with wine were to be apprehended when they were sober; that any other minister less cool than myself would have taken this as a declaration of war; and that I now addressed myself to him, to know the reason and meaning of this unbecoming way of talking.’

Podewils attempted to pass the thing off as meaning nothing. ‘The king,’ he said, ‘is much afraid of seeing the empire become the theatre of war; but as to attacking Hanover, I swear to you that he has never dreamed of it.’ On which Hyndford resumed:—

‘Neither you nor any one here can answer for what the King of Prussia will or will not do. He neither has a council, nor will follow any, but he must answer for any rash steps he takes. And, although the king my master is a younger elector than Brandenburg, yet, sir, I would have you remember, he is a much greater king; and if your master shall insist that there must be an army of observation, which most certainly will make a diversion in the empire, the question then will be, who has the longest purse as well as the longest sword, and I leave you to judge of the event.’

Having thus failed in making the desired impression on the English minister, Frederic suggested that, by what he euphemistically called ‘the secularisation of the ecclesiastical principalities,’ or, in more everyday language, by laying violent hands on the territory of certain bishops whose crime it was to be weak, and by annexing also some of the free cities, the emperor might be able to arrange an amicable treaty with the Queen of Hungary. At the same time he proposed to the emperor to appeal formally to the diet for support. The diet might, he conceived, summon the several powers of the empire to raise an army for the emperor’s defence; the Prussian contingent would be the largest and by far the most effective; and Frederic would thus, as a matter of course, have the command of the army of the empire, which, under the name of ‘the army of observation,’ would be charged to protect Germanic soil from foreign invasion.

In this matter Frederic was too cunning. He had, perhaps, hoped that his iniquitous proposal of spoliation and robbery would not become publicly known till it had to be carried into execution. But it was no interest of England's to maintain secrecy. Hyndford had at once told him 'that neither the Queen of Hungary nor her allies would ever consent to the secularising, for the emperor's use, either Salzburg or Passau, because it would be giving him the key into Bohemia, Austria, Styria, and Carinthia; '* and Carteret, turning it off as a joke, said to Haslang, the imperial minister in London, 'You may do what you like with the bishops, but two Protestant princes, such as the kings of England and Prussia, cannot sacrifice those who, like the free cities, have suffered for the Gospel.' The cause of the bishops he left to the Queen of Hungary, who loudly denounced the scheme as impious, and raised a clamour which rang from one end of Germany to the other. Charles escaped being arraigned for a projected violation of the constitution only by hurriedly disclaiming and disavowing the whole business; and when he turned to the alternative which Frederic had proposed, it was but to find the feeling of the offended diet such that no measure would be received which so evidently tended to refer the whole issue to the Prussian army. It was not, indeed, the custom of the diet to give a direct refusal to any proposition. The passive resistance of interminable delays and adjournments was more in accordance with usage, and this it now employed. After several months of tedious discussion it passed an obscurely worded resolution, expressing a wish for peace and referring the points at issue to the mediation of England and Holland—the two powers against whom the proposed 'army of observation' was to act.

Long before even this decision was promulgated, Frederic had realised his failure. As early as February 11 he had written to Podewils, on whom he could conveniently vent his ill-humour:—

'You do not appreciate the consequences of this advance of the English into Germany. They will enter Suabia, will attract to them all the princes of the empire, and will compel them to join their army. They will drive the French out of the empire; they will give law to Germany; will make the Grand Duke King of the Romans, and will then snap their fingers at all the declarations they have made to us; and it will be all your fault, because you have an inconceivable pre-

* Hyndford to Carteret, January 18, 1743.

dilection for these abominable English, and—half-drowned hen that you are—think I shall be undone if I venture to assert myself, and make the King of England feel that I do not like his goings on, and am in the mood to oppose them. . . . My opinion is that France should enter Suabia with a considerable army, and should have another in Brabant ready to attack Flanders, as soon as the English and Hanoverians start. I'll go bail that they'd turn back very quickly.'

But whilst he was thus writing to Podewils; whilst he was taunting Valori with the sluggishness of the French armies, and the incapacity of the French generals; whilst he was endeavouring, with all the resources of his bitter and unscrupulous tongue, to goad the French into advancing into Suabia, he was, at the same time, suggesting to Hyndford, as we have already seen, that it would be much better for the English to attack France directly. 'Do to France 'what you please,' he continued to say; 'if you like to 'attack it in Flanders or Lorraine you are free to do so. 'I've nothing to say against it.' Hyndford, not a selfish man, thought that the knowledge of this suggestion would be interesting to his French colleague at Berlin. In writing to Carteret on February 1, he thus reported a confidence he had made to M. de Valori:—

'“My dear marquis,” I said, “since you have entered upon the “subject of the King of Prussia, if you will give me your word of “honour never to mention what I am going to tell you, I'll tell you “something that will surprise you.” Here he gave me his hand, and promised in the most solemn manner. I then said, “Your good opinion “of the King of Prussia and his professions to your court will hardly “allow you to believe that the King of Prussia is at this very time “insisting and endeavouring to persuade the king my master to attack “France in her own dominions, instead of marching into Germany.” The astonishment that the marquis was in is not to be expressed. After some pause, he burst out with this exclamation: “Is it possible “a prince can be so treacherous! But since that is the case, France “must look to herself.” I will not pretend to judge’ (added Hyndford) ‘whether the retreat of the French is the effect of this confidential conversation, or whether I have done right or wrong in this bold step. Whatever the consequence may be, I thought myself, at that time, when the King of Prussia was and is still doing everything in his power to thwart the king our master's measures—I say, my lord, I thought myself sufficiently authorised to make this confidence to the French minister in order to give France a jealousy of the King of Prussia.’

Valori, of course, repeated the confidence to his own Government, but added, ‘I think that Lord Hyndford has, perhaps, ‘laid his colours on a little too thickly.’ After all, however, the duplicity of the King of Prussia does not seem to have

exercised any real influence on the course of events. He found himself powerless, unless indeed he resolved to throw his own sword into one of the scales; and that he would not do, preferring to watch and wait. The possibility of his interference was probably in the minds of all parties, but does not seem to have modified their action; and indeed, since they could neither calculate on his conduct nor depend on his honesty, any speculations concerning either could lead to no practical result.

It is unnecessary to follow in detail the history of the campaign of 1743, which the Duke de Broglie has related with his customary grace, though not always, perhaps, with his customary exactness. He does not, indeed, claim to throw any new light on the military transactions; but we may be permitted to point out that he has in some instances strayed from the true path. It is, for example, not quite correct to say that at the beginning of the war the English troops were as badly equipped and as badly disciplined as they were badly led; on the contrary, though few in number, and with no experience of actual war, the discipline of the English soldiers in Germany was fairly good. Neither is the account of the mutiny of the Highlanders free from error. It is not correct to say that 'when the time came 'for them to embark, they broke into open mutiny and 'returned to their mountains to the sound of the bagpipe.' M. de Broglie does not mention his authority for this version of a well-known incident in the history of the 42nd Regiment, the facts being that the mutiny was very partial; that the mutineers were overtaken and captured at Oundle; and that the bulk of the regiment embarked without delay, and joined the army in Germany a few days after the battle of Dettingen.*

Nor indeed can we quite accept the Duke de Broglie's account of the battle of Dettingen, which he affects to consider a check to the French arms rather than a defeat. That the allied army, numbering only some 38,000 men, was stupidly and carelessly led into a place where it was beset by the French army nearly 60,000 strong, is true enough; and that the dispositions of the Duke de Noailles have been very commonly pronounced excellent is also true, although they involved dividing his army and thus exposing it to the risk of being (as actually happened) beaten in

* Cannon's 'Historical Records of the 42nd or Royal Highland 'Regiment of Foot,' p. 31.

detail. It is easy to say that, but for the hot-headed disobedience of the Duke de Gramont, the English army—of which, however, barely one third was English—must have been hemmed in and forced to capitulate. It is at least as easy to say that had the allied army been really English, or subject to one general instead of four, it would not have given the French the chance of hemming it in. But these many ifs, one way or the other, do not alter the fact that the French guards, turned into ‘Main ducks,’ were driven across the river by what the wags of the army described as ‘a third bridge carpeted with blue cloth;’ and that Frederic—who did, at least, know the difference between a check and a defeat, and had every interest in learning the exact state of the case—wrote to Podewils on July 3:—

‘I am much mortified by the news which I send you and which I have just received from Hanover. You will see in it the account of the battle which my uncle—may the devil fly away with him!—has gained over the French. I am not going to waste time in criticising the miserable conduct of the French, but have to consider the possible consequences of this victory, and, taking things at the worst, will therefore point out to you what I think we have to apprehend. Firstly, the complete pre-eminence of the King of England and the Queen of Hungary in the affairs of the empire; secondly, the election of the Duke of Lorraine as King of the Romans; thirdly, a league, which will be far from advantageous to us, between England, the Austrian, the Saxon, the Dane, and the Russian. You will say that Denmark and Russia will not join together in an alliance with England; still, it is not impossible. Lastly, it is to be feared that at the general peace an attempt may be made to take a slice off our conquest. . . . The events of this year do not smile for us: we must hope that we shall have our turn by-and-by. I admit that I have pretty well foreseen what has happened up till now, but I was not prepared for this blow.’

But, indeed, the doubt expressed by the Duke de Broglie is merely formal; for his account of subsequent events recognises the fact that the allies were masters of the situation, and proves that their not turning it to advantage was due not to their weakness but to a difference of opinion, amounting almost to discord, between England and Austria. King George retired to Worms, and stayed there all the summer. The Austrians reduced the few posts which the French still held in Bohemia or Bavaria, and Prince Charles appeared on the banks of the upper Rhine. But there was no attempt at any active operations, and the season passed away in a sort of armed truce, and in the interchange of minor courtesies between Carteret and Noailles. The cause of this inaction has always seemed curious, and has been

differently attributed to the incapacity or the parsimony of King George, and to the unwillingness of Prince Charles to undertake any joint operations, the credit of which would accrue to the King of England as the nominal commander-in-chief. These considerations may possibly have had some weight; but the real and effective cause—which has not, we believe, been fully exposed till now—was the serious disagreement between the two courts about the settlement of the questions at issue in Italy, where the object of the English was to exclude the Spaniards, so as to weaken the maritime power of the House of Bourbon in the Mediterranean; whilst the object of Austria, on the other hand, was primarily to keep inviolate the Austrian territory.

By all parties the alliance of the King of Sardinia was desired; all were ready to pay for it, and each offered to hand over to him a portion of the enemy's territory. France, in the name of Spain, offered the left bank of the Po as far as Mantua—all the Milanese, in fact, reserving the right bank of the river, including Parma and Placentia, possibly even Tuscany. On the other hand, England, in the name of Austria, offered the Spanish provinces of central Italy, but the coast line only of the Milanese. In many respects the offers were fairly equal, but the English alliance seemed in itself more advantageous. 'Why should you prefer,' said the French ambassador at Turin to the Sardinian minister, the Marquis d'Ormea, 'a little strip of the Milanese, gained by the intervention of England, to the whole of it, gained by the assistance of France?' 'For this reason,' answered Ormea: 'We think that a part, without a Bourbon prince in Italy, is worth more than the whole with the Infant at our gates. The Infant's relations are too powerful.' This consideration and an English subsidy of 200,000*l.* would have at once decided the question, but for the curious complication that whilst England and France were bidding in the names of Austria and Spain, Austria and Spain resolutely and positively refused to sanction the offers so made. The Queen of Hungary declared that she would not part with an inch of territory beyond what had been torn from her by the treaty of Breslau; whilst the Queen of Spain protested vehemently against any diminution of the spoil she claimed for her sons. 'She was betrayed,' she cried, 'abandoned, sacrificed by Louis; sooner than accept such conditions she would throw France over and treat directly with England.' Maria Theresa held almost identical language. 'I would rather treat with France,' she said;

‘it would not ask me for anything, and might perhaps aid me to recover what I have lost.’

‘The only way,’ says the Duke de Broglie, ‘in which England could meet this prolonged and apparently unbending resistance, was by retarding or slackening her action in Germany, until she obtained what she asked for in Italy; and this calculation, which is clearly indicated in all the English despatches of the period, explains better than every other cause the curious stagnation of the military operations during the whole season.’

We think indeed that the Duke de Broglie might have gone even further, and attributed to this dispute the dangerous and much-condemned delays in the advance of the allies previous to the battle of Dettingen. That this was a real cause is clearly indicated by the correspondence of Mr. Villettes, the English Minister at Turin, and especially by his letter of May 23, in which, after much detail, he says:—

‘If, as Sir Thomas Robinson has insinuated, the further progress and success of Lord Stair’s passing the Rhine is made to depend on that of the Italian treaty, and the king’s army is declared till then to remain upon the defensive and unactive, I don’t see how the Court of Vienna can avoid complying with his Majesty’s exhortation, and satisfying the King of Sardinia, at least in a great and reasonable measure, and so far as this Court may think it better to accept of the offers made them, than run the hazard of joining with France and Spain.’

The pressure so brought to bear was, in the long run, too much for even the high spirit of the Queen of Hungary, and she yielded her consent. The preliminaries of the treaty between Austria, Sardinia, and England were signed in the English camp at Worms on September 13. By the terms of it, something very like the Pragmatic Sanction was repeated; the Austrian territories were guaranteed, in accordance with former treaties dating back to the Treaty of Utrecht, but omitting any specific mention of the Treaty of Breslau. Frederic was at once on the alert. By the Treaty of Breslau, Maria Theresa had ceded Silesia to him. As, in the Treaty of Worms, no mention was made either of Silesia or Breslau, the omission would have appeared suspicious to a much less suspicious man than Frederic. By an article of the Treaty of Worms, the King of Sardinia engaged ‘as soon as Italy should be cleared of enemies, to furnish sufficient troops to maintain the security of Austrian Lombardy, so that the queen might employ a greater number of her own in Germany.’ On which article Frederic remarked:—

‘The Queen of Hungary wants to withdraw her troops from Italy to

employ them in Germany. Against whom, then? Bavaria? She has so thoroughly beaten the emperor that she is in actual possession of his hereditary states. It seems very much as if she was meditating a new war. That can only be against me. By the engagements he entered into at Breslau, the King of England is bound to communicate to me whatever treaty he makes. He has kept a close silence concerning this. The reason is plain. What has been agreed to at Worms and ratified at Turin, annuls all that he assented to at Breslau.'

It was not only the Treaty of Worms which excited Frederic's suspicions; other things confirmed them. A treaty of alliance between Maria Theresa and the Elector of Saxony seemed to bode him no good; and the republication, in stronger terms than usual, of the queen's protest against the validity of the emperor's election, received extraordinary emphasis from the action of the Archbishop of Mainz, Chancellor of the Empire, who formally entered it in the minutes of the Diet. The emperor demanded that the entry should be erased, and appealed for support to all the princes and electors. These, however, as a body were not inclined to adopt any such extreme measure. The emperor was an elderly man and in the most feeble health; he could not be expected to live long, and it was unnecessary to make a bitter enemy of his probable successor. But Frederic had no intention that the husband of the Queen of Hungary should be the emperor's successor, and had no scruple about giving offence. Podewils advised that the answer sent should be that 'his Majesty would consult with the well-intentioned electors and States, with a view to ward off 'any ill effects of the archbishop's unconstitutional step.'

'No!' wrote Frederic savagely, on October 6, 'I'm determined you shall speak out. You are more like a *poule mouillée* than any man I ever came across. I'll have you speak most plainly; and let me read your letter to the emperor, and our instruction to Klinggräffen, wherein stress is to be laid on the liberties of Germany, which the Queen of Hungary is trying to enslave. Dohna must stir himself at Vienna. In a word, 'tis necessary to sound the tocsin against the Queen of Hungary.'

And to Count Dohna he wrote with no less violence on October 8, concluding with a postscript in his own hand.

'Make the devil's own row. Say that we and the whole empire are beginning to see that they want to upset the Constitution, and warn them to desist from any projects they may have formed on that score, so as to prevent the fatal consequences which they will bring, not only on the empire but on themselves; and don't behave so like a *poule mouillée* as you generally do.'

And this letter, with this postscript, signed 'Federic,' was officially countersigned by Podewils and Borcke.

It is thus certain that, by the beginning of October 1743, Frederic had in view the prospect of a speedy renewal of the war against Austria, as a precautionary measure in defence of his booty. But notwithstanding this and his well-simulated passion, his proceedings were guided by cool calculating foresight. In diplomacy as in war, in robbery or in perfidy, his work was that of a master, and he had learned to appreciate the disadvantage of entering on a war against Austria with no ally except France. He had been spoken of as endeavouring to subvert the constitution of the empire by bringing in foreign armies. Through the length and breadth of Fatherland, wherever the German tongue was spoken, Maria Theresa had proclaimed him a traitor, and the facts were patent to all Europe. He had, therefore, long before this, seen the necessity of allying himself with the smaller German States, and he still clung to the idea of an army of observation, which was to be really an army against the King of England. Just at present, that was the one foreign power which his delicate jealousy for the constitutional liberties of the Empire objected to. Others, if only in opposition to Austria, might come and go as they pleased. As early as August 25, he had written to Podewils:—

'If we succeed in winning the goodwill of Russia, as seems not improbable, I shall be in a position to play an important part in Germany, and may perhaps be able to engage the Empress [of Russia] to furnish auxiliaries to maintain the liberties of the empire, which its neighbours are bent on oppressing. But even if this should not be so, you will admit that the advance of 36,000 men as far as Minden will make the King of England sing to a very different tune: and that sooner than see his hereditary states ruined, he will relinquish many of his ambitious schemes, such as the acquisition of Hildesheim and Osnabrück, the giving law to the empire, or the forcing the emperor to abdicate. My troops must be called troops of the empire, and, without hostilities, be quartered along the Weser, by August 1744. I am much mistaken if this will not restore to the emperor what belongs to him; and we too shall find our advantage in it, perhaps on the side of East Friesland, but principally in the credit which it will give me in the empire. I have an exact detail of the queen's army, from which it appears that it musters no more than 30,000 regulars and 4,000 Hungarians. With such limited resources, she is not in a condition to engage in fresh wars, and will be less tempted to do so as I shall not commit any hostile acts. You see then how necessary it is to make a show of vigour—supposing, that is, that this Russian business turns

out all right; and that without it, though my strength is infinitely greater, I shall be held as cheap as my father was.' *

A happy chance had won for him the Tsarina's heart. The Marquis de Botta, the Austrian ambassador at Berlin, had been the year before at St. Petersburg, where it was now suspected he had been cognisant of a plot in favour of the dethroned infant Ivan. It was really no business of Frederic's, one way or the other, but as he wrote, 'C'est l'heure 'du berger: now or never is our chance.' He declared that he could not receive at his court a man who had given his dear sister such serious cause of complaint, and requested Botta to apply for his passports. At the same time, he wrote to the Tsarina, mildly blaming her for her clemency, and suggesting measures for keeping the young pretender to her throne out of harm's way. Elizabeth was touched by so much sympathy and kindly feeling. 'Would you believe,' she said, 'that there are venomous tongues which have been 'trying to persuade me to mistrust the King of Prussia as 'a knave? I think rather it is they who have been trying 'to deceive me,' and forthwith she sent her acceptance and guarantee of the Treaty of Breslau.†

The alliance thus happily secured he sought further to cement by a marriage between his near relation, Sophia of Anhalt, then a girl of fifteen, and the Grand Duke Peter, who had been declared heir to the throne of Russia. The princess, though little more than a child, was strongly opposed both to the husband and the creed which had been found for her, and it required the pressure of Frederic's authority to make her consent either to be re-baptised or married. She did, however, yield, and, under the name of Catherine, proved in after years a worthy niece of her uncle Frederic. The marriage did not, indeed, actually take place till the following spring, but Frederic's purpose was equally served by the preliminary negotiations.

Meanwhile his aim was to work by and at the expense of

* *Politische Correspondenz*, vol. ii. p. 409.

† By a total absence of dates in this portion of his work, the Duke de Broglie permits it to be understood that this curious negotiation with Russia was subsequent to Frederic's violent outburst against the Archbishop of Mainz. It is, therefore, necessary to point out that whereas the Treaty of Worms was dated September 13, and the letter to Count Dohna October 8, the attempted revolt in favour of Ivan was early in August; the letters relating to it begin on August 20, and Botta received his passports on September 30.

his allies. On October 2 he handed to Podewils a paper written by himself, with instructions to read it, dictate it even to Valori, but under a pledge of secrecy: on the slightest indiscretion, he would disavow it. This paper, entitled 'What the French ought to do if they are sensible,' was a scheme for the campaign of next year. For this year, he said, it is over. But next year, they ought to strain every nerve to have 160,000 men ready to put into the field. Of these 70,000, under Noailles, ought to make head against the English; 60,000 to act against Prince Charles, and the remaining 30,000 in Flanders. They should be ready to take the field in March, so as to fall unexpectedly on the English or Austrians in their winter quarters. The English especially they must not spare, and to attack them on their weak point they ought to let loose their privateers on them. So much for France herself. But she will need succour from abroad, that is, from Germany. The King of Prussia cannot openly offer it on account of his treaty with the Queen of Hungary, but he cannot fail to send his contingent to the army of the empire. A free hand will do a great deal towards starting this; liberal contributions will be required, only the money should be paid indirectly. The King of Prussia would undertake this. Otherwise it would look bad, would wound German sensibilities, and do harm instead of good. But if an army of 60,000 men is assembled in the heart of Germany, it will soon bring the Queen of Hungary to reason.

Valori did not see matters quite in the same light, and refused to forward a proposition according to which France was to undertake the whole burden of the cause. If the King of Prussia was in earnest, he ought to declare himself; but the minor German powers would certainly not move without Prussia's example. France had no special interest in the matter, nor objection to the imperial crown returning to Austria. She had fought Austria before now, and was ready if necessary to fight her again; but a cat's-paw of Prussia she would not be for a second time. And though, during the next two months, Frederic reverted again and again, on every opportunity, to the necessity of France loosing her purse-strings, he could get no other answer. Valori, in ordinary course, reported the whole affair to his government. 'The King of Prussia,' wrote Cardinal de Tencin to Noailles, 'has communicated to M. de Valori a project of his, desiring him to send it off at once to the king as a mark of his friendship. It is wanting in common sense.'

But though the French Government thus refused to accept the King of Prussia's scheme, a certain modification of it commended itself to them as likely to lead to good results. They would not lavish large sums to increase the authority of Prussia; but the war party, consisting of Richelieu, Noailles, and Tencin, warmly supported by the Duchess de Châteauroux, had carried the day over the more timid counsels of Amelot and Maurepas; and, on a full understanding of the Treaty of Worms, an offensive and defensive alliance with Spain was concluded on October 23. This expressly stipulated war with Sardinia, and necessarily meant war with England, even though it might be postponed for a few months. They were therefore all the more anxious to strengthen themselves in Germany; and for this purpose, Chavigny, a wily and experienced diplomatic agent, was sent to Frankfort, where he quickly found that the minor princes of the empire had by no means the aversion implied by Frederic to French money even from French hands; and before the King of Prussia had any clear knowledge of the negotiation, a league had been formed, not unlike that which he had suggested, but with the important difference that France, not Prussia, was its head. This was not at all what Frederic had conceived, and he at first refused to be a party to it. He thought, it would seem, that his refusal would upset the whole business, and it was only when he realised that the indefatigable Chavigny had overcome all the difficulties which Klinggräffen, the Prussian ambassador at Frankfort, had thrown in his way that his objection became less positive. But Chavigny's agreement with the German princes was scarcely concluded before it was shaken to the very foundations by the action of the French Government in the cause of the pretender to the English throne.

On January 9, 1744, Prince Charles Edward suddenly left Rome as though on a hunting party, and, travelling in disguise to Genoa, took ship, and landed at Antibes on the 27th. It was believed at the time, and since, that this step was suggested and instigated by Cardinal Tencin, who had long entertained the most intimate relations with the House of Stuart, and owed his cardinal's hat to the immediate influence of the titular King James. The Duke de Broglie however, considers that Tencin's share in this business has been overstated, and that he had no direct cognisance of the prince's journey till the prince had actually landed on French soil. We find it difficult to agree with M. de Broglie on

this point. He quotes, indeed, Amelot, as having written to Valori, on February 15 :—‘ It will probably be judged that the prince’s departure from Rome could only be made on an understanding with France. It is, however, absolutely true that the king, far from having any share in the step, was quite ignorant of it.’ And we know also that on February 11 this same minister assured Mr. Thompson, the English *chargé d’affaires*, that, ‘ for his part, he had no hand in it.’

‘ I looked at him ’ (wrote Thompson) ‘ very earnestly, which made him add that I might perhaps think it a little extraordinary, but he could assure me that he was so far from being concerned in that affair, that he had not even heard of it till after the young man had left Rome.’

Tencin also, in speaking to Thompson, made very light of it.

‘ He said it was “ tour de jeune homme qui l’avait pris sous son bonnet sans consulter personne ; ” that the first news he had of it was from the Pope, who had written to let him know that the young gentleman had left Rome on January 9, under pretence of going a-shooting, and that after he had got at some distance he had taken a different route from what he had pretended, and was come for Antibes by way of Genoa. The Cardinal said he supposed the young man was grown weary of the idle life he led at Rome, and therefore was come away to make a campaign with Don Philip.’ *

That Amelot’s denial was genuine is quite probable ; but Tencin’s has not the ring of truth, and so indeed thought Thompson. On February 15 he again wrote :—

‘ When [the prince] came away from Rome, I am told it was the Bailli Tencin’s *valet de chambre* that went beforehand to prepare the relays upon the road ; and some people imagine that the Bailli himself was the person unknown [who received him] at Antibes, which is not unlikely ; but whether it was the Bailli or whoever else it was, I am persuaded this step was not so unconcerted as they would have me believe. . . . Another proof of this project being concerted is, I think, the Cardinal Aquaviva busying himself about a passport for him, which may give room to suppose further that the Courts of Naples and Madrid were not without a hand in it, if they have not the greater share. To look upon the matter in that light, it will appear to be a scheme laid between the Spaniard and Cardinal Tencin (for I do not believe all the French ministers have concurred in it), in order to try to embarrass us, and to see what effect the young man’s appearance in France will have in England.’

This is, however, only hearsay and speculation, though it is the hearsay and speculation of a responsible man extremely

* Thompson to Duke of Newcastle, February 12, 1744.

well placed both for hearing and for forming an opinion. But what goes far beyond Mr. Thompson's reports is the fact, which the Duke de Broglie thinks of little consequence, that on January 13 a commission was signed by the king directing the Count de Saxe to take command of a body of troops destined for the invasion of England, 'under the orders, however, of our very dear and much-loved brother James III., King of Great Britain; and in his absence and till his arrival, in concert with whomsoever is charged, in his name, with the government and administration of his kingdoms.'* We cannot agree with the Duke de Broglie as to the insignificance of such a commission, so worded, and issued at the very time that the young Prince was on his journey from Rome. Taking into consideration this coincidence of the dates, we find it impossible to believe that it was not determined by something more definite than a mere chance whim of 'the young gentleman.'

Immediately on the news being received in England, Mr. Thompson was instructed to require that 'this person should be obliged to retire out of France if he was actually in it.' Amelot waited several days, and on February 25 answered that the existing treaties had been so often violated by the King of England and by his orders, that the King of France could not be bound by them until he had received satisfaction. Having transmitted this answer, which the Duke of Newcastle not unnaturally described as 'injurious and offensive,' Thompson received orders to quit Paris as soon as possible. War was, in fact, declared on March 15, though for some reason it was not proclaimed till the 28th. Direct hostilities had in reality commenced more than a month before. In the previous December M. de Court, commanding the Toulon fleet, had received orders to prepare for sea; and further orders, in the middle of February, to put to sea with the Spanish squadron and break the blockade which the English, under Mathews, had enforced for nearly two years. M. de Broglie's account of this event, though merely incidental to the main current of his story, is strangely inaccurate. He says the fleet was ordered to leave Toulon 'so as to join the Spanish fleet'—('pour se joindre à la marine espagnole')—which had, in fact, been for the past two years shut up in Toulon; and to make head against Mathews, who is described as having been cruising on the coast of Naples since the preceding summer;

whereas neither Mathews nor the English fleet had been near Naples, but had been occupied during the whole time in maintaining the blockade of Toulon. Such errors are the more remarkable, as the blundering misconduct of the battle, and the many scandals which followed it, rendered the circumstances painfully notorious in England, and gave rise to a cloud of pamphlets which can scarcely have escaped the notice of an investigator even less keen than the Duke de Broglie.

At the same time the Brest fleet, under the Count de Roquefeuil, had been ordered up the Channel to convoy the troops from Dunkirk into the Thames, and to cover their landing at Blackwall, or some other suitable place as high up the river as possible. The troops, to the number of 10,000, were under the command of the Count de Saxe, nominally controlled by the Young Pretender, who was openly recognised as Prince of Wales. The Prince was curiously ignorant of the country and the people over whom he wished to rule, and his ignorance rendered him hopeful.

‘Count Roquefeuil,’ he wrote to Saxe on March 9, ‘had orders to blockade Norris in Portsmouth. I cannot understand how he has let him escape, or why he has not followed him to the Downs, if it is certain that Norris is really there.’ And on the 11th he added: ‘I am sorry to find the news of Norris’s escape confirmed, and that he is likely to get some accessions of strength in the Downs. The sooner, therefore, we can attack him, the cheaper will be our victory, of which I have no doubt. I learn from sure sources that seventeen ships of the line is the very most that England can get ready before the summer; and if they have scraped together a number of miserable frigates or armed merchant ships to try and frighten us, or by way of keeping up their own credit, it ought to incite us to make the more haste to expose the pretence.’ *

The actual facts were very different from what the prince pictured them. On March 6, M. de Roquefeuil’s fleet had got as high as Dungeness, where it was unexpectedly confronted by Sir John Norris, bringing a vastly superior force from the Downs. The numbers of his squadron were twenty-five ships of the line, as against sixteen with M. de Roquefeuil. But Norris was a very old man, and the fire of life was burning low. It was late in the day, the wind was adverse, and he was content to anchor for the night. The French, waking suddenly to a knowledge of their danger—so contrary to their previous information—held a hasty council of war, and resolved to weigh at the turn of the tide,

and be off while escape was yet happily possible. It was then dark; and about nine o'clock the wind, which had fallen very light, veered round to the northward and blew a violent gale. Those of the French ships which had not yet weighed were blown from their anchors; and all, without further delay, ran down Channel under all the canvas they could venture to spread. Thanks to Norris's lack of energy they got clear. But the Dunkirk transports which were waiting for them were not so fortunate. The northerly gale caught them in the outer anchorage; many of them were lost, though the men on board seem for the most part to have escaped with the fright and the ducking. And of the rest almost all lost their boats, their anchors, their cables, and were so damaged in their rigging that the king sent down orders to disembark the troops and to postpone the expedition till a more favourable opportunity.* For the time the projected invasion of England was at an end; and at the very moment of this disappointment Louis discovered that his recognition of James III. had given grave offence and alarm to the petty princes of the Empire, whose alliance Chavigny had so painfully procured, and from which so much had been expected.

The two links by which England was connected with Germany were the Protestant religion and the Hanoverian dynasty. Many princes who were quite willing to assist in administering to England a political check were utterly averse to a Catholic attack on Protestantism; and there were many who by relationship or affinity claimed kindred with the royal house of England, loved to fancy themselves within the possibilities of succession, and had no intention of aiding in any measures which might lessen their chances, and would certainly lessen their dignity. Of these the Prince of Hesse was at once the most powerful and the most interested. He had a considerable army, a large proportion of which had fought side by side with the English at Dettingen. He had had a treaty of subsidies with England, but its term had run out, and he had since accepted Chavigny's golden arguments, and had undertaken to support the cause of France and the emperor. But he was a Protestant, and his son had married a daughter of King George II. To lend a hand towards driving Austria out of Bavaria was one thing; to lend a hand towards subverting the Protestant religion was another. Still more so was the

endeavouring to ruin his son's or his grandson's possible chance of the crown of England. 'If King George wants 'Hessians to defend himself,' he said, 'can his son-in-law 'refuse? Does France want universal monarchy for her 'favourite religion?' The poor old emperor, who saw his hopes falling to pieces, whimpered out, 'They ought to have 'consulted me before making me the centre of a religious 'war;' and Chavigny, who, notwithstanding his humble rank, saw more clearly through the turbid waters of German politics than anyone in France, wrote to the king:—

'I beseech you, sire, to remove this phantom of the Pretender. There will always be some malcontents in England, but no dependence is to be placed on them. If I had ever had any prepossessions in favour of the Jacobites, I should have been cured of them before now. They're a poor lot; good for nothing but to ruin themselves and everyone who attempts to work in concert with them. In order to save the empire, let us join with the German Protestants. It is the way, sire, which your forefathers took, and they found it to their advantage.'

Frederic had long been wavering. He was loth to appear as second to France; he also deeply distrusted the French statesmen and the French king. For some months he had been sounding in the waters of Parisian intrigue by means of a friendly agent, Count Rothenburg, who doubled the parts of rake and diplomatist; and whilst in the former character he won the affections of Richelieu and Madame de Châteauroux, in the latter he endeavoured to turn them to the profit of his master. Rothenburg reported that the King of France was more than friendly; that he was Frederic's warmest eulogist; that he was in the habit of expressing himself in regard to Frederic, his army, his diplomacy, his discipline, his genius, his energy, in terms of gushing admiration. All the same, when words had to be translated into actions, the French Government was not correspondingly prompt; the enthusiasm of the king was tempered by the caution of the ministers; and whilst professing every desire to take an active part in the war, they virtually refused to move till the King of Prussia set the example. They had no intention of pushing into Germany, only to find themselves once again left in the lurch. This was not quite what Frederic wanted. He wished to remain arbiter of the situation, free to act or not act as seemed most to his advantage, and was not unnaturally annoyed at the pressure now put on him. He fancied that Rothenburg was exceeding his commission, and did not scruple to tell him, in the most familiar manner, that he was sent to Paris

to watch and to listen, not to talk. 'Take a dose of 'magnesia every morning,' he added, 'and don't act rashly.' Nevertheless, when he found that the French declaration in favour of the Pretender had shaken the alliance of the German Protestants, he considered it time to take a more decided course, and appealed to the Prince of Hesse, urging him strongly not to give up the cause of Germany for the sake of England. All that France wished to do, he said, was to give the English troops occupation at home; as to any idea of a dynastic change it was out of the question.

It was then that the King of France, breaking free from the timid caution of his ministers, committed himself to the bold counsels of Madame de Châteauroux and her party, and decided on immediate action. He announced his intention of taking the field himself. He would emulate the prowess of his great-grandfather. Amelot was summarily dismissed; in future he would be his own foreign minister. At this critical moment France had mustered under arms some 300,000 men. In Alsace, an army under the Marshal de Coigny was ready to advance into Germany. On the north, a force under the king in person and Marshal Noailles was threatening Flanders; and connecting the two was a third army under Saxe, who, in spite of his German birth and Protestant profession, had just been raised to the rank of marshal. In the south was the so-called army of Italy, under the Prince de Conti. To support such an armament the strain on the country was very great. The taxation was excessive, and was increased; notwithstanding which there was an estimated deficit of a hundred millions (4,000,000*l.*) 'A few years earlier, or later,' says the Duke de Broglie, 'such demands would have excited universal groaning and indignation, and the Parliament in a body would have carried its remonstrance to Versailles. But just at this time everyone was rejoicing at having a king once more, and not a murmur was raised.' As the king was leaving Paris, his mistress would fain have accompanied him. But to this step her own confidants, Noailles more especially, were distinctly adverse; and, without putting themselves in open opposition to her will, they succeeded in persuading the king that the expense would be so great that in the present financial stress it ought not to be thought of. Louis, not without regret, assented; and thus, to the delight of the people and the great increase of Noailles's popularity, the duchess was left behind, whilst the king, without either

persuasion or regret, adopted the same pretext for refusing the queen permission to join the army.

The warlike attitude of France and the sudden display of energy on the part of the king, could not but surprise the different nations of Europe. To an enemy less stout of heart than the Queen of Hungary, they might have seemed pregnant with danger. She, however, was undismayed. She rejoiced over the events which another might have judged untoward. Her enemies were now before her: her allies were forced to declare themselves. The news of the young Pretender's arrival in France and the French declaration of war against England gave her real pleasure, and she said to Robinson: 'God himself had done a miracle for the preservation of Europe, in permitting the French, through their blindness and presumption, to declare war, which would wake us, she hoped, though she hardly believed it,' adding with vivacity, '*Je ne suis plus la seule principale.* 'Eh, mon Dieu! si je voulais faire comme mes alliés!'^{*}

Following on this, the French declaration against Austria, April 26, served but as an opportunity for her to issue anew an eloquent manifesto, repeating the long list of injuries which, during many centuries, Germany had sustained from her enemy beyond the Rhine. The hour of vengeance had come; and in a state of exaltation, she refused to stand merely on the defensive, or to take any secondary part in the struggle; to support the English in Flanders, or to bar the passage of the enemy to Hanover. Now, it was on the side of Flanders that England had intended to attack France; but without the 40,000 Austrians on which she had counted, the allies would not have more than 50,000 men to array against the French king's army of 100,000. In this difficulty Hyndford was directed to claim from the King of Prussia the assistance which, by the defensive treaty, he was bound to supply when England was threatened with invasion. Frederic answered that if Great Britain should be really invaded, he was ready to send, not the mere stipulated assistance, but an army of 30,000 men, and would himself command them. 'At the same time,' he added, 'you must admit that, as yet, it is not quite clear that you are not the aggressors, both at the Hyères islands and else-

^{*} Robinson to Carteret, April 27, 1744. The Duke de Broglie, in improving the language, has quoted this as '*Je ne suis plus la partie principale,*' which is not quite the same thing, nor does it, we think, convey the queen's meaning.

‘where; and that it is not you who, by insults and open hostilities, have forced the French to declare war against England, which would totally change the nature of the engagements of a purely defensive alliance.’ ‘I think,’ he wrote to Chambrier the next day, ‘that they will take very good care not to let me into their islands at the head of 30,000 men.’

Hyndford did, in fact, reply that they did not want his assistance in England, but in Hanover, where he was bound by the treaty to support them. Such support Frederic would not give, though he could not deny the agreement; and so cut short the negotiation by withdrawing from Berlin, to drink the waters at Pyrmont. For he did not wish to break finally with England till he was satisfied as to the action of France, on which, now that Louis was joining the army, he might shortly be better able to judge. Meanwhile, he doubted of everything. He doubted the reality of the French king’s awakening, and thought it quite possible that a peace with England or Austria might be patched up as hastily as war had been resolved on. Still more did he doubt the capacity of Coigny, who was old and feeble. Any effective attack on Austria must be made from Alsace, and he was anxious to see Belle-Isle once again in command; Belle-Isle, whom he knew, and who alone of the French marshals had won his approval.

The history of the intrigue by which he endeavoured to effect this, is in the highest degree interesting and curious; and M. de Broglie tells at length how Rothenburg worked on M^{de}. de Châteauroux; how he was seconded by Tencin and Richelieu, jealous of the ascendancy which Noailles was acquiring over the king, and how it was resolved amongst these conspirators that, at all risks, the duchess must join her royal lover, and so bring to the plot the weight of her personal influence. Her mere presence would be a first check to Noailles; and though she had no great ardour for the interests of Belle-Isle, she was keenly sensible of the importance to herself of her not being too long separated from the king. The difficulty was, in face of the direct prohibition, to find a pretext for her journey. The Dowager Princess de Conti was persuaded to arrange it, and took her as one of her ladies-in-waiting. The whole business was managed by Richelieu and without the knowledge of the king, who, though not displeased by it, was innocent of at least this offence against public decency. But the indignation both at Paris and in the camp was excessive. Richelieu

had thought that the presence of the duchess would again give rise to comparisons between the king and his ancestors, Louis XIV. and Henri IV. What it did give rise to were angry howls, mixed with indelicate jokes and obscene songs.

Against the storm, of which probably only a faint whisper reached her ears, the duchess bore up gallantly, and took to herself no small share of the glory, if not of the credit, of the army's success. Lille had already fallen: her lover hurried from her arms to the siege of Ypres, when Noailles announced that it was time. It was a fiction still in vogue, that the fall of a fortress was due to the presence of the king during the last days. Louis arrived in the camp on June 16: the town surrendered on the 25th.

'I am at the tip-top summit of joy' (wrote the duchess to Richelieu). 'Think of taking Ypres in nine days! Nothing could be more glorious, or flattering to me. His great-grandfather, great as he was, never equalled it. But as he has begun, so he must go on. The body of the piece must be in the same key as the prelude. And I flatter myself this will be so, because, as you know, I prefer looking at the sunny side of things, and because I believe that my star, which is not a malign one, influences everything. It will serve instead of good generals and ministers. *He* has never done a better thing than commit himself to its guiding.'

All this exultation was short-lived. Whilst the army of Flanders seemed about to carry everything before it, Prince Charles, at the head of 80,000 Austrians, crossed the Rhine at Wassenau and Mannheim, and pushed on towards Alsace. The imperial marshal, Seckendorff, to whom the defence of the river had been entrusted, was rolled back, as the enemy advanced by the same route as a later invasion, past Weissenburg and Wörth. Coigny, unable to oppose him, retreated to Haguenau, leaving the passes of the Vosges open and unguarded. Lorraine, the patrimony of his fathers—Lorraine, out of which France had so shamelessly swindled his family, lay at the feet of the invader. He had but to enter and take possession. He was on the high road to Paris, and no opposing force before him. 'When you hear that I have passed the Rhine,' he had written to his wife, 'expect my next from Paris.'

The news of all this reached Louis whilst he was visiting Dunkirk and the adjacent ports, contemplating, we may believe, the resumption of his plans for a diversion in England. Everything had now to be postponed to the driving back of Prince Charles. Noailles was hastily sent to Metz, where Belle-Isle was in command, and had already

made such dispositions as were possible. The king himself followed. Noailles had vainly attempted to persuade him that his presence was unnecessary, and that he was incurring a needless risk. When France was invaded, he declared, it was for him, and for him alone, to drive out the enemy. But the situation was extremely critical. Coigny's army was dispersed into the furthest corners of Alsace, and the small force which Belle-Isle had been able to raise for the defence of the passes of the Vosges was utterly inadequate. Nothing but the immediate arrival of the royal army could save the province from being overrun, if not conquered; and Noailles, impressing on the king that if he insisted on coming in person he must lay aside his regal state and come as a soldier, wrote: 'It will otherwise be impossible to move as quickly as the service demands, independent of the difficulty of finding subsistence in a country occupied by the army and already wasted by the enemy.' To which the king replied, 'I am full of impatience to be at Metz to confer with you and M. de Belle-Isle. I will dispense with my train. The cut of mutton which does for a subaltern of infantry will do for me.'

Just at this time the King of Prussia declared himself. By his latest treaty, Bohemia was assigned to the emperor, but a considerable slice of it was allotted to himself, and, with the grand army of Austria entangled in France, the present moment seemed favourable for seizing on at least his own share. He professed, indeed, to be actuated mainly by an honest desire to aid an ally in difficulties; a little, also, by the fear that France might yield to the pressure and make peace on any terms; in which case he would find himself alone, with the whole force of Austria, flushed with victory and conquest, ready to fall on and repossess itself of Silesia. The motives were plausible but untrue, and their want of truth is proved by a mere reference to the dates.

Prince Charles crossed the Rhine on July 2-5; during the first weeks of July, he, or rather Coigny, was scattering the army of Alsace to all the points of the compass; the road to Lorraine was open, the danger was imminent, but Frederic made no sign. He wrote, indeed, encouragingly to Louis and to Noailles, expressing his intention of entering Bohemia on August 13—after Prince Charles had been six weeks in France; but this private communication was no pledge, and did not publicly commit him. On July 23 Chambrier wrote—handsomely enough, it must be admitted—of the king's determination to march in person against

the invader. By the 26th the news of the king's march had allayed the panic. 'The state of affairs is entirely changed. Every one of his majesty's subjects shares in the glory which he has gained by a proceeding so noble and generous.' Such was the exaggerated language in which French gentlemen thought it fitting to describe the French king's hastening to the defence of his invaded territory. But the meaning is plain; and on the 29th Frederic wrote, definitely announcing his determination to support him in an efficient manner. His manifesto against the Queen of Hungary was issued on August 10. From all which it is manifest that Frederic's decision was due to the appearance that the French army in Lorraine would be equal to its needs, and that there was a reasonable chance that Prince Charles would be so handled that, winning or losing, his army would not be equal to further efforts in Bohemia. The position, no doubt, was, as he himself afterwards wrote in his memoirs, one in which immediate decision was necessary, and where the most dangerous thing of all was to do nothing. What he did was in accordance with sound policy, and, in this hard world, scarcely calls for any particular blame, but, on the other hand, does certainly not entitle him to pose as the scrupulous observer of treaties, or the chivalrous defender of the weak and oppressed.

On August 4, Louis entered Metz. The success of the campaign seemed already achieved, for on certain intelligence that the King of Prussia was about to enter Bohemia, Prince Charles was compelled to retreat. It was left for the French to turn that retreat into a rout, and drive the flying battalions headlong into the Rhine. This was what Frederic had counted on, was what he had a fair right to expect. Amongst the French soldiers the enthusiasm was at its height. They began to be proud of their king, and condoned his offences. Under his eyes, they were prepared to vindicate the old reputation of the French army. Already the rejoicings anticipated the triumph that was to come. August 7 was spent in feasting; on the 8th there was to be a grand *Te Deum* for the successes of Conti in Italy. But when the 8th came the king was ill with headache and high fever, and was unable to attend. The *Te Deum* was postponed, and Noailles set out from Metz alone.

The king rapidly became worse and was in extreme danger.* The account which the Duke de Broglie gives of

* The Duke de Broglie speaks of the disorder as 'a putrid fever,'

this illness is amongst the most interesting and, in some respects, the most amusing of his sections, and may be referred to as the most complete account of what must be considered the turning-point in the life of this wretched monarch. He describes, in exact detail, the charge taken of the royal patient by Mdme. de Châteauroux and Mdme. de Lauraguais, under the protection of the Duke de Richelieu; the almost forcible breaking of the blockade by the princes of the blood; and the priestly action by which the frail sisters were ignominiously banished and the power of Mdme. de Châteauroux for ever broken. Her downfall gave general satisfaction at the time; the story of it now excites rather our pity and our sympathy. Blameable as she was, her vices were those of her surroundings rather than her own. It was not foreseen that the king's deathbed repentance would vanish as he regained strength; nor was it realised that the influence of the Duchess de Châteauroux, though equally impure in principle, was to be far healthier in practice than that of any of her successors.

But what we are just at present more especially concerned with, is the fatal effect of this sickness of the king on the conduct of the campaign. Noailles had been all along the virtual commander-in-chief. He was none the less so now. But the peculiar responsibility under the special circumstances, the reflection that on the king's death the queen would be regent in the name of her son, and that this meant the utter ruin of his own credit, all tended to unman him; and, regardless of the position of Frederic, to whom, in any case, some consideration was due, led him to think that the peaceful retreat of the Austrians was the best thing that could happen. They were well out of the country; let them go; and they went.

Here we are again compelled to stop. The former volumes ended abruptly with the treaty of Breslau, by which Frederic perfidiously left his allies in the lurch, exposed to the vengeance of Austria. At the close of this second instalment the parts are reversed. It is now Frederic who, calculating on the support of the French, is entering Bohemia, there to find himself exposed to the onslaught of the Austrians, allowed, by the ineptitude of Noailles, to escape uninjured from what ought to have been their destruction; and thus the whirligig of time brings in its revenges.

that is, typhus. The different symptoms and circumstances seem rather to point it out as what is now distinguished as typhoid.

ART. V.—*The Holy Bible, containing the Old and New Testaments, translated out of the Original Tongues: being the Authorised Version set forth A.D. 1611, compared with the most ancient authorities and revised. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge: 1885.*

IT needs but little historical imagination to link this Revised Version with much that is of deepest interest in the past, and, in some manner, with the highest problems of human thought. For, as a matter of fact, the translating of the Bible has been associated with the critical epochs in the history of human progress when, as the outcome of a previous development, the new sprang from the old which it had conquered and possessed, and which at the same time it incorporated and transformed.

The first translation of the Old Testament dates from more than two centuries before our era. Its language was Greek, the universal medium of communication of the civilised world; its home Alexandria, if not the capital, yet the emporium of the ancient world. Thither commerce poured its riches; there industry gathered the treasures of ancient learning. This Jewish community became the representative and the guide of that great mass of its co-religionists commonly known as 'the Dispersion,' not so much from the number, wealth, or influence of its members as from the new mental direction, of which the Greek version of the Old Testament, known as the Septuagint, was alike the sequence and the cause. Undertaken with the patronage, if not by direction, of the book-loving Ptolemies, it was the harbinger of a new day both to the Jewish people and to the world at large. Without it, Judaism could not have continued in the West; nor could Christianity have found an entrance on issuing from its birthplace in Judæa. Far away in the shadow of the barren hills of Palestine the religion of the Old Testament shrivelled and dried into sapless formalism; by the banks of the Nile it stretched its limbs towards the sun and drank in a fresh youth. In Palestine the descendants of Israel knew nothing but of Hebrews and Hebrew; in Alexandria the most learned and patriotic of the Jews knew scarce anything of Hebrew, but learned and loved what was Greek. In Palestine they excluded all outside themselves; in Alexandria they would have included all. But, as a first requirement, the Hellenic world must have the old Bible in its own language. So

this version met a present want; it indicated a deeper need; it expressed a larger hope. The Alexandrians regarded it as verbally inspired. It was so in another and higher sense than they meant or could have imagined. The Palestinians understood it better when they cursed the day of its birth; for by it the old linked itself to the new, and over it Christianity passed on its march of world-conquest.

This was the earliest Biblical translation, memorable also on other grounds than that of its bearing on Synagogue and Church. The next translation came in quite a wave of versions when Christianity was borne into all lands. It progressed and spread with the spread of the new faith. These early versions in all the chief languages are identified with the planting of Christianity.* They are also identified with the new civilisation which was its outcome, and the new literature to which it gave birth. Yet another wave of Biblical translation came when that period had run its cycle, and the revival which in letters and philosophy became 'Humanism' found in morals and religion its expression in the Reformation. Here also it was identified with a new era of life and culture, the language and literature of which it helped to frame. It may sound strange, and yet it almost seems as if we were in presence of another wave of Biblical translations. It is not only that the Scriptures are rendered into so many new languages, partly helping to form them. But in Germany the old Luther-Bible is now undergoing repeated revision, while among ourselves the Version which we have called 'Authorised' has for the same purpose been committed during the last fifteen years to a company of learned men who were to make searching examination of it, not to change nor renew it, but to remove its blemishes, and to restore the old treasure purified and brightened. The work has been done, and the verdict of the nation is now challenged how the trust reposed has been kept and the purpose in view accomplished.

* Even the translation of the Jewish convert Aquila, primarily intended against the Christian use made of the LXX; those of Theodotion and Symmachus, probably also Jewish proselytes; and probably the *Quinta*, *Sexta*, and *Septima* (of which we know little definite), so named from their position in Origen's *Hexapla*, must be connected with the rise of Christianity. Of the so-called *Versio Veneta*, which cannot date earlier than the thirteenth century, this is not the place to speak. The *Peshitto* seems, in all probability, of Judæo-Christian origin, and in any case is post-Christian. (On this difficult subject compare the article of Nestle in Herzog's 'Real-Enc.' 2nd ed.)

We are not under any temptation to exaggerate the result of this fifteen years' work of revision. Indeed, as we write, it has perhaps already passed the zenith of its popular interest, and we scarcely wonder at this, nor yet wish it otherwise. It will never be what it was intended to become: the People's Bible; and it perhaps marks rather the agedness of criticism than the freshness and vigour of young life. Yet in some sense it is no exaggeration to say that it possesses national importance, alike in its religious and scientific aspect. As regards the former, the unparalleled interest which the work excited, not only at its inception, but during the long period of its continuance, and at its termination, is sufficient evidence how deeply it had stirred public feeling. The impulse had come from different directions. The admitted fact that our Authorised Version, despite its unquestioned excellence and matchless beauty, represents the original in many cases inadequately, in not a few incorrectly, had led to a general feeling of vague distrust which, in such a matter, it was desirable to remove as speedily as possible. Unhappily most men, at any rate of British birth, are, or imagine themselves, naturally theologians. In these circumstances a little Hebrew is a dangerous thing, and of all ignorance experienced ignorance is probably the worst. Most of us have had painful experience of startling assertions, extraordinary renderings, and wild critical ventures, all made on the ground of the incorrectness of our English version. For these certain evils, as well as for the possible good that might accrue, an authoritative revision was evidently most desirable. To the misgivings of some as to what might come to us, and the fears of others as to what might be taken from us, there is happily now an end. Alike one and the other have in great measure proved groundless. The Revisers of the Authorised Version have entered in text or margin almost all that has been said worth the hearing, although perhaps not all that should be said, together with much that should not have been said. There have been many—as we think, far too many—alterations. Yet English readers will have still to all intents and purposes their old Bible. And they will cherish it the more that they will receive what has been left, not only with greater confidence, but also cleared of many obscurities of expression and obvious errors of rendering.

This is one aspect of it. To prove the general interest of the public it scarcely needed the elaborate and coloured accounts furnished by the newspapers of the bustle and labour

connected with the issue of the new version, and of the jostling crowd that awaited its appearance; nor the computations of the Leipsic 'Theologische Literaturblatt,' as to how many kids and sheep were slaughtered to furnish the material needful for the binding; or how the paper for the printing supplied by one firm alone, if cut up into strips half a foot wide, would have encompassed the entire globe. This, however, is clear, that the future historian of our period will have to deal with it as a fact that, at the close of the nineteenth century, the Bible had so far retained its hold on the English-speaking race that even the much invalidated Old Testament proved to be the book of incomparably greatest interest to all classes of society.

Putting aside, as beyond our province, the question how the stimulus given to the reading of the Old Testament by the appearance of this new version may affect any future religious developement, there is yet another aspect of the matter interesting to the literary, and more particularly to the theological, student. Undoubtedly the new version marks a period in the history of Biblical criticism, more especially of Old Testament exegesis. It indicates the critical *terminus ad quem*, possibly also that *a quo*. Five-and-twenty years earlier such a revision could not have been undertaken. German criticism was still under the ban—and without German criticism the present Revision of the Old Testament could not have been made. If this be deemed too sweeping, at any rate the necessary scholarship was not sufficiently diffused to render possible such co-operation in the work by all Christian communities as alone would secure general confidence. Similarly, we may at least express a doubt whether twenty years after this so large an accord of critical opinion could be expected. And this not more from fundamental differences than from an increasing tendency to make alterations on the Massoretic text, not only where they are suggested by ancient versions or different readings, or even where the text offers serious difficulty, but also where the proposed amendment gives in the opinion of the commentator a better meaning—that is, often one better according with his view of what the text should say. There is in this process of emendation something specially fascinating and provocative of ingenuity. An able Hebraist will not find it difficult by slight changes to amend almost any passage into something that gives 'a good meaning,' whether or not it be the true one. Not that we would discard all emendations. Sometimes they seem

absolutely necessary ; at others they are so plainly suggested by the text that it seems almost impossible to avoid them. But it is a dangerous path on which to enter : a feast so spiced that appetite comes with the eating. Those who have followed the course of recent commentaries must have been struck with the rapid progress in this direction—especially on the part of a certain school—till almost every striking verse is remodelled, and one feels tempted to ask whether the original writers would recognise or understand their own compositions.

When we add that the Revisers of the Old Testament version have kept clear of this tendency or temptation, we have already in part vindicated the conjecture that the present may mark the utmost limit when work like that before us could have been carried out on the same lines. But this is not all. Even those moderately acquainted with modern exegesis will perceive to what extent and in how many directions the present Revisers must have exercised self-restraint—perhaps some would say, have acted on the principle of compromise. A comparison of the margin with the text of the Revised Version will show how important in its effects was the rule that required a majority of two-thirds for any alteration in the text, and how necessary, if the present character of the translation was to be preserved. We may safely go further, and express our conviction that for the sake not only of the highest religious interests, but of sound scholarship and sober criticism, it was well that this rule should have been enforced. If it has deprived us occasionally of a valuable rendering, it has much more frequently saved us from rash conjectures, doubtful even in the margin, which represents the critical battle-ground, but wholly inadmissible as substantive amendments in the text of the ‘ People’s Bible,’ which should contain only such alterations as were absolutely necessary and at least well-nigh certain. But we are anticipating.

Before proceeding further it is necessary that we should guard ourselves against possible misunderstanding. We have neither the desire nor intention of withholding from the Revised Version the fullest measure of grateful and appreciative recognition. On the contrary, we heartily acknowledge that it marks wide, accurate, and careful scholarship. The alterations in the rendering represent not one school of criticism, but all directions and the widest range, embodying alternately the views of Cheyne, Delitzsch, Ewald, Hitzig, Hupfeld, Kalisch, Knobel, Thenius—in short, of all the

well-known scholars of Germany and England. Nor have they even in the revision of a book followed the lead of any one or two critics whose commentaries may, perhaps deservedly, be specially identified with it. From the wide scholarship of the Revisers this might, indeed, have been expected, but it is pleasant to find their independence from the words of any one teacher practically confirmed. And here it is a grateful duty to record that moderation has in special manner been exercised in regard to at least many of the passages which, so to speak, have become classical in the history of English devotional expression. It would have been unpardonable *Philistinism* to have altered such texts or phrases, even where the language does not give the original in the utmost adequacy or with the strictest faithfulness. In a considerable number of instances we feel, indeed, obliged to differ from the Revisers. We could wish to see some things altered that are left untouched, and many more left untouched that have been altered; to have some renderings in the text which are in the margin, and some in the margin which are in the text. But in the great majority of instances the alterations are really corrections; in many they remove obscurities, while in not a few they for the first time make the meaning of the original intelligible to the English reader, or else bring out its beauty. Even among those alterations which are trifling there are some which contribute to the elucidation of the text.

The object of these remarks has been to put on record a general and deep appreciation of the work of the Revisers, and to do this in the most emphatic and unstinted manner. If the task had been to discuss any ordinary retranslation of the Old Testament, it would have been our duty to illustrate the justice of this praise by a selection of happy instances of correction, or by a reference to some of the passages in which the new version does not seem to give the original adequately, or where on critical grounds the new rendering seems untenable. Thus the materials would have been furnished for forming a sufficiently accurate estimate of the work as a whole. But in the present instance the task imposed is, as we conceive, different, and the duty which it involves less pleasant. Let it be remembered that we have not here to do with an independent new version, such as that of the prophetic books by Hitzig; nor with a translation accompanying a commentary, such as that prefixed to every Psalm in the classical work of Delitzsch, or that which forms the text to the learned notes of Dr. Cheyne on Isaiah; nor have

we here before us a work intended only for scholars or critical students. The question, therefore, is not whether the Revisers have produced a most scholarly and valuable work—on that point few, if any, would entertain serious doubt—nor yet whether they have removed some of the chief mistakes and obscurities of the old version—on which, likewise, all would be agreed—but whether they have performed their special task, on the lines laid down for them, in such manner that the Revised Version might henceforth be accepted in place of what is now known as the ‘*Authorised*.’ On that issue we are bound, respectfully but unhesitatingly, to record an adverse judgement. Perhaps the task was one which in present conditions was almost impossible of achievement, since restriction to the fewest possible alterations, which was the necessary condition in a Revised People’s Bible, was scarcely compatible with the demands of the most advanced criticism, which constantly pointed to much more radical treatment than was consistent with the defined object in view, or, we may add, with sober exegesis.

The result is what might have been expected. We have had a ‘coalition’ Company of Revisers, of which the bond, if not the principle, was compromise, one or the other prevailing tendency appearing alternately in text or margin. The effect of this, as of most compromises, will scarcely prove satisfactory to either party. The one will complain that the revision has been made by too timid hands, held back by other considerations than the requirements of exegetical science. The other will urge that too many alterations, some of them not at all wise, have been introduced. And in a measure both parties are right. As a rule, the changes of an unimportant character are far too numerous. In many cases they are quite unnecessary, or else of doubtful advantage; in others, they require for their understanding either a refinement and subtleness of distinction, or a knowledge of the commentaries on which they are based, neither of which could be expected from ordinary readers; while, lastly, viewing the Revised Version as destined for the mass of the population, there are many instances which must prove, if not misleading, certainly bewildering. Thus we are driven to the conclusion that, with all its improvements on the old rendering, the Revised Version may be a step towards the attainment of, but is not that ‘*People’s Bible*’ which is to take the place of what has hitherto been among us ‘*The Bible authorised to be read in Churches and Schools.*’

Comparisons are proverbially odious. Yet the question will naturally occur, and perhaps as naturally be expected to be answered, as to the relation between the Revised Version of the Old Testament and that of the New which had preceded it. One difference between the two will at once be obvious. Public opinion, at least as represented by its ordinary organs, which on such occasions are wont to follow each other with tolerable regularity, has in great preponderance pronounced an unfavourable criticism on the revision of the New Testament, and a more favourable one on that of the Old. Yet we believe that, in respect of both, a fuller examination will result, not, indeed, in a reversal of this general verdict, but in giving weight to considerations on the other side which had been overlooked or too hastily passed by on a first rapid survey. Neither the Revised New nor the Revised Old Testament will take the place of the Authorised Versions. In this respect they have failed in their object, despite their intrinsic merits. The Revised New Testament is not and has perhaps even less claim to become the 'People's Bible' than the new version of the Old Testament. Nevertheless, if we make abstraction of those grave objections to the fundamental principle in regard to the original text on which the revision has been made, or, if it be preferred, if we make allowance for this, we believe that a calm and careful study of the Revised New Testament will bring to light such varied and solid excellences as will greatly and increasingly enhance the estimate of it. Used not instead but by the side of the Authorised Version, it will prove a very solid boon to every student of the New Testament who has not the time or the means for that learned and thorough investigation of which it is the product. It is with some hesitation and with great reluctance that we venture on a different forecast as regards the revision of the Old Testament. Its excellences lie on the surface; its defects and its faults will increasingly appear on closer investigation. We are greatly obliged by what it gives, or rather restores, of the original in its correctness or in its fulness of meaning. In its turn the Revised Old Testament will also be a necessary adjunct to the Authorised Version—perhaps in some respects one more necessary than in the case of the New Testament. But once its general excellences (as in the other case the general objections) admitted, we doubt whether fuller examination will not diminish rather than increase the sense of security of the reader: on the one hand, his confidence in its sufficiency and in the certitude which it offers; on the other hand, his reliance on

the accuracy of its details, on the need, the wisdom, or even the propriety of some of them. And there are even more serious objections to it than these.

We might carry our comparison further; but we are warned that we have entered on dangerous ground. To put the matter in plain language: the Revisers of the Old Testament have in several respects enjoyed an advantage over their colleagues of the New. First: the Revisers of the New Testament considered it the necessary preliminary to their work, if not 'to construct a continuous and complete 'Greek text,' yet to revise the Greek text as the foundation of their new version. It is not our business here to criticise the lines on which they proceeded; but there is at least no doubt that the great majority of the objections taken to the revision of the New Testament owe their origin to this revised Greek text. Now the Revisers of the Old Testament avoided this difficulty altogether by adopting the Massoretic text. Secondly: it may be asserted, without implying offence, that the Old Testament Revisers must have profited by the experience of their colleagues of the New Testament Company. The adverse criticisms which their multitudinous changes in the rendering of the text brought upon them from all directions must have taught them the need of caution, and introduced or strengthened among them a powerful conservative, or rather preservative, element in opposition to changes. Thirdly: the errors to be corrected in the Authorised Version of the Old Testament were far more glaring, as well as numerous, than those in the New Testament, and the obscurities to be removed far greater. Hence the effect of the changes was both more easily apparent and more striking. Lastly: we may perhaps venture to suggest that, as the Old Testament is not so well known in its details as the New, the multifarious little alterations which attracted so much attention in the latter would in part pass unobserved in the former. In short, comparatively few exceptions were taken to the Revised New Testament on the ground of differences of rendering; the strength of the opposition was directed against the text which had been adopted, and against the infinity of small worrying changes which met one in almost every verse, and which seemed to savour of the pedantry of the pedagogue. If the Old Testament Company are happily in no danger of attack on the former ground, they are, as will appear in the sequel, quite as guilty on the second charge as the Revisers of the New Testament.

It has been stated that the Hebrew text which forms the foundation of this revision is that commonly known as the *Massoretic*. As the subject is of considerable importance, and not generally sufficiently known, it seems not out of place to devote some space to it. The popular notion as to the absolutely sacred guardianship of the Hebrew text by the Jews is only partially founded on fact. It is true as regards the post-Massoretic, not the pre-Massoretic, text. In general the Hebrew text has a distinctive history in each of the three, if not four, periods of its existence. Of the first of these, extending to the time of Ezra and of his successors, little can be known with certainty. It was the practice to write on skins, perhaps linen, and probably also on papyrus; and the characters used were the archaic Hebrew, kindred to the ancient Phœnician and Moabite, as on the well-known Moabite stone. On the latter, as on the Siloam inscription, the words are separated by dots; but this was not the universal practice, as little as the division of, and into, sentences by horizontal strokes. In poetry the verses and their parts were probably indicated by separate lines and intervals. A slight consideration will show how easily errors might creep into the text, partly from the mere fact of transcription, partly also from the irregularity of the ancient characters. Among such errors we must, no doubt, include many of those where diverging, or erroneous, names and numbers are given in different accounts of the same event.

The records of the Hebrew text become increasingly definite during the second period of its history. Roughly speaking, it extended from the time of Ezra to that of the completion of the Talmud at the close of the fifth century of our era. During these nine centuries and more the canon had not only been formed and closed, but most of that critical and grammatical *apparatus* was prepared which, orally transmitted, was afterwards embodied in what is called the *Massorah*. For the history of the text the change then introduced from the archaic Hebrew to the Aramæan characters—the ‘square’ or ‘Assyrian’ writing—is of importance.* Alike the Talmud† and Christian tradition ascribe the

* In the Talmud the ancient, Samaritan, writing is designated *raats* (Jer. Meg. 71 *b*) or *roets* (Sanh. 22 *a*); another reading is *daats*—expressions variously interpreted as ‘broken,’ ‘scratched’ (Hamburger), ‘pointed stroke-writing’ (Geiger), ‘involved’—one letter into the other (Levy). It is also designated *libonaah* (Sanh. 21 *b*).

† But there were important authorities who maintained that the

change to Ezra, and there is little doubt that it at least originated with him. It kept pace with the displacement of the ancient Hebrew dialect by the Aramæan. But the adoption of the new writing, which, indeed, itself passed through a course of developement, must have been gradual. At first it seems to have been confined to the learned, and the retention of the old characters by the Samaritans, as well as their appearance on the coins of the Maccabees and also later, bear witness to this. The use of the ancient characters on the coins may, indeed, also have had a political reason: to identify the new with the old. But there is neither evidence nor reason for believing in such a sudden change as the immediate and absolute substitution of the so-called 'Assyrian' for the old writing, while everything points to the inference that the old characters were still known and partially used. On the other hand we conclude, from the allusion of Christ to the shape of the 'square' characters (St. Matt. v. 18), that at the beginning of our era the old Hebrew had in common usage given place to the so-called 'Assyrian' writing. Since that time the characters in use have remained unaltered.

A glance at the similarity of some of the square Hebrew letters will show how easily mistakes might be made in transcription. The Talmud already warns against this source of error (Shabb. 103 *b*, towards the end). But there were others of even more serious import. They have been classed as due to misreading, mishearing, and mental confusion, to faults of memory, and to misunderstanding.* The deviations from the correct text due to any of these causes may be designated as unintentional. Of any purposed alterations in an evil sense (for controversy, &c.) there is no evidence, although changes may have been introduced from an idea that thereby imaginary inaccuracies would be corrected, or else in the attempt to fill up gaps, or to restore what had become illegible—perhaps also that which the text was supposed to have originally expressed. But with what conscientious self-restraint those acted who collated and finally fixed our present text, appears even from their

Law had originally been written in the square characters, and that this writing had been lost on account of Israel's sin, but restored by Ezra (Jer. Meg. 71 *b*, *c*, and, with some divergences, Sanh. 21 *b*).

* Compare De Wette-Schrader, 'Lehrb. d. histor. krit. Einl.' pp. 199-201. Each of these groups accounts for different kinds of mistakes.

incorporating different recensions of the same pieces,* and faithfully reproducing undoubted discrepancies.† There are other indications also of their critical conscientiousness to which we shall immediately refer, and which greatly enhance our estimate of the value of their labours.

That, in the circumstances above indicated, errors or variations may have occurred in different manuscripts—more especially in those destined for private use—needs no further explanation. Absolute evidence of it comes to us from the Greek version of the Septuagint. That many of the differences between it and the rendering which our Massoretic text would require may be due to misreading, carelessness, ignorance, apologetic patching, interpolation, or that critical stupidity which so often poses as supreme wisdom, may be freely admitted. But at the same time it is impossible to doubt that the Septuagint translators must in many instances have had before them a text differing from ours. As to the comparative value of this text modern opinions greatly differ. For ourselves, we can only express the wish that our Revisers of the Old Testament had more rarely appealed to the authority of the Septuagint or recorded its ‘improvements.’ We do not question the value of some of these Septuagint renderings, although it is not easy always to feel sure what the text before them really was, apart from the alterations due to their translation of it. Nor should we lose sight of the uncritical condition of the present text of the Septuagint. We may not indeed go so far as Lagarde, who, in the present state of the text, would wholly forbid its use for critical purposes,‡ yet at least extreme caution is requisite. Perhaps this suggestion to the Revisers by their American colleagues was too sweeping: ‘Omit from the margin all renderings from the ‘Septuagint, Vulgate, and other ancient versions or “authorities.”’ Yet, as pointing to a very serious danger, there was practical wisdom in it, and this in more than one direction. For the question, which of these ‘renderings’ should be accepted, requires in each case exact critical knowledge, and

* Such as the Elohimic redaction in Ps. liii. of the Jehovic Ps. xiv. Compare also 1 Chron. xvi. 8–35 with Ps. cv. 1–15, xcvi. and cvi. 1, 47, 48; and other instances.

† Those of names and numbers in the books of Samuel and the Kings compared with Chronicles are well known; but there are others, on which we cannot here enter.

‡ Quoted, although with serious reservations, in Cheyne, the ‘Prophecies of Isaiah,’ vol. ii. p. 215.

involves points which more than many others necessitate sound critical judgement and a nice critical tact. There are those who are ever prone to give the preference to a Septuagint reading and rendering, and those who go to the opposite extreme of too indiscriminately rejecting them. In most instances it is a subject for critical discussion, suitable for a Commentary intended for students, but manifestly impossible in a People's Bible. Inserted in the margin as suggestions unexplained, unsupported, and undiscussed, they can have only a bewildering effect on the general reader, and cast in an element of doubt and distrust where the first object should have been clearness and consistency, if not certainty.

The divergences which undoubtedly existed in the text used by the Septuagint naturally suggest that similar variations may have occurred in the manuscripts circulating in Palestine itself. The presumption seems certainly in favour of this view, since it is impossible to ascribe the Egyptian or Samaritan variations entirely to negligence or arbitrariness. At the same time we refuse to believe, with some writers, that for one reason or another liberties had been taken in Palestine with the sacred text, and this not only as regards its wording but even in some sense its contents. In any case a later revision has restored to the text that greater purity in which we now possess it. And in measure as the sacred text, and here primarily the Pentateuch, was used in public worship and for other religious purposes, its accuracy and uniformity would necessarily become objects of increasing care. There can be no doubt that fixedness must soon have been the rule, at least in all the rolls used for public and official purposes. We are expressly informed that there were standard copies kept in the Temple, perhaps also in some synagogues. This would not exclude, rather it seems to imply, the existence of diverging readings in manuscripts belonging to families or individuals. At the time of Christ, at any rate, the *textus receptus* must have been fixed, and both Josephus (Ag. Ap. i. 8) and Philo (Euseb. 'Præpar. 'Evang.' viii. 8, 13), attest the general reverence entertained for it, and the scrupulous care attaching to it. Indeed, this seems necessarily involved in the views entertained in regard to the inspiration of Scripture and the character of the Law. The text of Aquila's and of Theodotion's versions in the second century of our era diverged much less from ours than that of the Septuagint, while the Targums (which date from the third and fourth centuries) closely follow it. The

same may be said of the Hebrew text of Origen's 'Hexapla,' and of Jerome. In the Talmud the sacred text appears as quite fixed so far as regards the consonants, and the antiquity of this may be inferred from the circumstance, that both the text itself and the emendations made by the Scribes are ascribed to authoritative tradition to Moses on Sinai (Nedar. 37 *b*). And although we come upon variations from our Massoretic text, these are of an unimportant character.*

The emendations of the Scribes to which we have referred concern three points. The first is known as the *Ittur Sopherim*, or removal by the Scribes in certain places of a letter (י). To this must afterwards be added what is called the *Tiqqún Sopherim*, or correction of the Scribes, the object of which was the removal of what seemed objectionable, inappropriate, or unfitting modes of expression.† For this there is already pre-Massoretic testimony. The second class of emendations consists of what are known as 'the extraordinary points' placed over certain letters or words to indicate that for some reason they are called in question, or that special meaning attaches to them.‡ Closely connected with this are the so-called 'suspended letters,' written above the line. A well-known instance of the latter occurs in Judg. xviii. 30, where, by the suspension above the line of the letter *n*, what otherwise would have read 'Moses' reads 'Manasseh,' although both the Talmud and the Midrash admit that the person referred to was the grandson of Moses. The Revisers have put 'Moses' in the text, and 'Manasseh' in the margin, while all the versions, except the Vulgate, adopt the reading of the suspended letter. The last and most important class of emendations are those known as *Qeri* § *velo Khethibh*, 'read but not written,' where

* The subject is far too wide for treatment in this place. The reader who wishes further information is referred to the work of Geiger already mentioned, to Strack, 'Prolegom. Crit. in Vetus Test. Hebr.' and also to the article 'Text der Bibel' in vol. ii. of Hamburger's 'Real-Encycl.'

† Thus in Gen. xviii. 22: 'The Lord stood yet before Abraham' was changed into 'Abraham stood yet before the Lord' (Ber. R. 49). Other instances are both very curious and interesting.

‡ Extraordinary points occur in fifteen passages (ten in the Pentateuch, four in the 'Prophets,' and one in Ps. xxvii. 13). All the fifteen passages in which these points occur are enumerated and classified by Geiger, *u. s.* pp. 257, 258.

§ Or rather *Qeré* (comp. Kautzsch, 'Gramm. d. bibl. Ar.' p. 81, note). On the vocalisation in each case see Gesenius, 24 ed. p. 57.

something was to be read not as it was written; *Khethibh velo Qeri*, 'written but not read,' where that was not to be read which was written; and *Qeri ukhethibh*, 'written and read,' which refer to a variation in the text.

Too great credit cannot be given to these 'Scribes' for the critical independence and conscientiousness of their labours in fixing the text. The opinion of Lagarde seems unsupported that all manuscripts must be traced back to one copy which had accidentally been saved at the capture of Bethar in the last Jewish war under Bar Kokhba (132-135 A.D.). On the other hand, it appears that the text was fixed, neither conjecturally, polemically, nor even apologetically, but by a comparison of manuscripts. It may be that errors have thus become perpetuated because they occurred in a majority of the manuscripts compared, and accordingly were incorporated in the text: in short, that the majority of readings had not always represented the best, and that sufficient critical judgement had not been exercised, indeed could scarcely have been expected. But for this last, if for no other reason, we should be all the more thankful for the hard and fast rule of deciding according to the majority of manuscripts. The Jerusalem Talmud (Ta'an. 68 *a*, lines 31 and following, from bottom) informs us that there were three copies of the Law in the Temple, of which each contained a peculiar reading, which was always corrected by the readings in the two others. This may seem a mechanical principle, although it is precisely that adopted in the rule which prescribed a majority of two-thirds in the present revision of the Old Testament. In truth, the latter seems less rational, since it consisted in counting the heads, irrespective of their contents, of those present, instead of counting authorities. Yet what, absolutely speaking, seems scarcely rational is often the only thing practicable. The Revisers could scarcely have been locked up, like a jury, till they gave a unanimous verdict, nor could, as in Scotland the verdict of the majority be simply recorded. And, unlike the rejected manuscripts, the aggrieved minority had the relief of the margin, of which they abundantly availed themselves, to the frequent bewilderment of readers innocent of Commentaries and criticism, who have to accept with equal thanks text and margin, not having the slightest idea of the grounds of their divergence, nor of the authorities on either side, nor even, as in a contested election, of the precise number that voted for one or the other rendering.

What has been said, with quite good-natured intent,

about this somewhat esoteric element in the new People's Bible may help to lighten what still requires to be added in regard to the important subject of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament. It is well known that the ancient Hebrew writing consisted only of consonants, without either vowel-points, accents, or other marks. This appears alike from the ancient versions, from Josephus, Origen, and Jerome, and from the Talmud; and it is to this day the absolute rule for all manuscripts of a sacred or a public character. This, however, does not imply that the vocalisation and reading of the words had been arbitrary or uncertain, although a number of divergences appear. Probably there was here the same gradual progress towards fixedness which we have previously noticed. At the beginning of our era all was virtually settled, and the Talmud implies that the text was read as at present. Closely connected with the pronunciation of the words would be their division. We have already seen that there is reason to believe that such divisions may have been marked at a much earlier period. In confirmation we recall that in the Samaritan Pentateuch there is a dot after every word; that the Septuagint mostly, though certainly not always, accords in this respect with our text; and even this, that the words are separated in the rolls used in the synagogues. It is otherwise as regards the division into verses, which would not date from such ancient times, although, as before stated, in the poetic parts verses and members of them were marked by lines and intervals. Indeed, the Rabbis prescribed a peculiar mode of writing some of these pieces: either 'half brick' (*ariach*), 'over half brick,' and 'brick' (*lebhenah*) 'over brick'—that is, that the words should be placed at each end of a line with an empty space between them, as in Deut. xxxii.; or else what is called 'half brick over brick, and brick over half brick,' when a line of three divisions, with a space between each of them, alternates with another line of two divisions with a space between them below the writing in the previous line, care being however taken that the word closing one line should, as regards the sense, belong to the next line. Of this mode of writing, prescribed among others for the Song of Deborah (Judges v.), and for that at the Red Sea, the following lines may form an illustrative example (reading the words from right to left):—

horse the	exalted highly is He for Jehovah to sing will I				saying
my become and Jah is song & strength my	sea the into thrown He hath rider his an				
God the	Him praise I'll	God my	This		salvation
					father my of

We must not prosecute this inquiry into the further question of the division of the text into sections—larger and smaller—and for various reasons, notably liturgical. Such division was perhaps even older than the arrangement into verses. Of greater importance for our purpose than such inquiries, however interesting, would be the question—if it could only be answered—as to the fate of all the manuscripts belonging to that period. We know that three of them were deposited in the Temple itself and served for comparison. Did they contain other than the trifling variations recorded? It could scarcely have been one of them which Josephus begged from Titus; which, then, was the copy of the Scriptures that he saved from the destruction of Jerusalem ('Life,' 75), and had it been public or private property? Again, we know that there were many copies belonging to synagogues and schools, as well as to private individuals. It is impossible to suppose that these manuscripts did not contain any divergences; in fact, such appear on comparison of our Massoretic text with notices in the Talmud. But what has become of all these manuscripts? Have they been all destroyed or buried, or may we hope for some discovery like the precious find of Greek and Hebrew manuscripts in large jars by Origen, of which Epiphanius and Jerome give a perhaps somewhat legendary account? The Shapira forgeries, with their rather unpleasant memories, should at least not quite extinguish such thoughts.

However interesting the subject, we cannot here trace in detail the history of the Hebrew text during the Massoretic and post-Massoretic periods. The former extended from the sixth to the eleventh century of our era. The word *Massoreth* or *Massorah* originally means 'tradition,' and in its special application to the work on the Biblical text indicates the writing down and completion of the critical results of the former period. Considerable obscurity still surrounds the history of this great undertaking. It was carried on both in Palestine (at Tiberias) and in the schools of Babylonia. The results of the labours of the West (Palestine) and the East differed in a number of points. The Western or Palestinian school ultimately prevailed, although not to the entire exclusion of the other, or Eastern. In general, the work of the Massorites may be described as embracing two objects: the writing down, and so fixing, what had been transmitted to them, and the continuation and completion of the critical and exegetical labours of their predecessors. All this was the more necessary since Hebrew was gradually

ceasing to be a living language. But we owe to the Massorites more than the final settlement of the *textus receptus* as regards its consonants. All previous critical notes were embodied in the Massorah; the same kind of work was continued and greatly enlarged, and grammatical conjectures as well as a large number of critical remarks were noted. Indeed, this is only a very inadequate account of the miscellaneous mass of information gathered in the Massorah.

Another and perhaps even more important work done by the Massorites was the vocalisation of the text. Once more it was the old reading, but it was now perpetuated and fixed, as against all variations, by the system of punctuation gradually developed between the sixth and eighth centuries. Here also the Babylonians and the Palestinians differed, and the latter prevailed. The system introduced settles the reading, and thereby determines the translation, of the Hebrew words, in a threefold direction: by marks which fix the precise pronunciation of the consonants, by vowel-signs, and by the accents. In general, the pronunciation thus obtained may be characterised as the purest and best, and as resting on the most ancient tradition, although this is not intended to imply that every reading is to be accepted as correct. The same may be said with regard to the accents by which the division of sentences and the relation of words to each other are determined. As regards the differences in punctuation between the Palestinian and Babylonian schools, that of the latter may—apart from divergences in reading and pronunciation—be generally described as the more simple, although both are supposed to have been derived from a common traditional source. Further than this very superficial sketch we cannot here enter.* It has already been stated that the Palestinian school obtained the victory. Complete agreement was not, however, at once attained, owing to differences between various authorities. Accordingly the next object was to determine the best readings and to mark all the variations. Along with this it was noted where and how often certain letters, words, or anomalies occurred, together with other particulars of great curiosity and interest. The model text of the Babylonian schools is the Codex ben Naphtali; that of the Palestinian school, the Codex ben Asher—both dating from at least the

* We must refer the reader to special works on the subject, and to the articles by Dillmann and Strack in the 2nd ed. of Herzog's 'Real-Encyk.'

first half of the ninth century. The former of these Codices was intended to reflect upon the latter, and, although itself lost, many of its readings have been preserved.

It only remains to add that the Massorah is distinguished into *Massora parva*, printed in the so-called Rabbinic Bibles between the parallel columns of Hebrew text and Targum (in manuscripts it is also in the margin), and *Massora magna marginalis*, above and below the text, and *finalis*. The *Massora parva* contains all the *Qeris*, and notably how often a word occurs in a special form in the Bible. The *Massora magna* contains all else besides, and in the *finalis* (in printed editions alphabetically arranged) an enumeration of the passages referred to in the *marginalis*, and other matters, as also certain differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, between the Western and the Eastern Jews, &c. (at the close of vol. iv. of the second Rabbinical Bible, printed by Bomberg). The collection of the whole Massorah, and the restoration on the basis of it of the full and pure Massoretic text, is the task to which modern research is being devoted.* What care, labour, and diligence it requires, needs no explanation. And, alas! alike the great Massoretic standard-copies and the earliest authoritative manuscripts are either lost or hidden away. The (Eastern) Ben Naphtali codex is lost; of that of Ben Asher (the Western) early copies are said to exist in Egypt, in Aleppo, and in Cracow. The oldest Hebrew manuscript existing is supposed to be one of the Prophets in a synagogue in Cairo, dating from 895 A.D., as such doubts are expressed about the Cambridge manuscript, for which the date 856 is claimed, that for the present it must be ruled out of consideration. Next to this supposed Tiberias manuscript of 895 in Cairo comes the manuscript of the Prophets in the library of St. Petersburg, dating from 916 A.D., which has been printed under the editorship of Dr. Strack; then a manuscript of the whole Bible in the synagogue at Aleppo, written about 930 A.D. Of this, as we are informed, there is another copy in a synagogue at Cracow. The next oldest manuscripts are also in the library of St. Petersburg, and respectively bear date 943, 946, 952, 961, 989, 994, 1051, 1122, 1195, and so onwards.†

* We here refer specially to Dr. Ginsburg's work on the Massorah; to the Massoretic Dictionary of Frensdorff; and to the Bible-text by S. Baer and Professor Delitzsch, now in course of publication.

† We should state that our authority for many of the statements here made are manuscript notes placed at our disposal by one of the

But, as already stated, most valuable manuscripts have been lost, although their variations have been recorded by other writers. The most important of these is the so-called *Codex Hillelis*—although certainly not due to Hillel II., still less to the great Hillel at the time of Christ—or, as others put it, *Codex Hillalus* (from its supposed origin at Hillah, near Bagdad). It was somewhat vaguely ascribed to about 600 A.D., and its fate can be traced down to the fifteenth century. ‘The variations quoted from this manuscript are very numerous, and manuscript Bibles at Modena and at Madrid have a long, if not a complete, list of them.’* For the present, till all the variations have been collected and critically examined, the Massorah text of Jacob ben Chayyim (in the ‘*Biblia Rabbinica Bombergiana*,’ ed. ii., cura R. Jacob ben Chayyim, Venet. 1525–26, four vols. fol.) must be regarded as the *textus receptus*.

This somewhat lengthy though, as it seemed, needful digression will at least clearly explain that the Revisers had no other alternative than to use the Massoretic text. There simply exists none other, although variations, whether derived from different readings or inferred from the ancient versions, should be admitted where the text evidently requires them, or where they seem so plainly congruous to it as to have almost self-evident force. It has already been said that the Revisers have sometimes placed in the margin that from the Septuagint which does not deserve admission. Illustrative instances of this have been pointed out, and might be greatly multiplied. Thus, the marginal addition from the Septuagint in 1 Sam. v. 6, is, so far as we know, scarcely accepted by any one in its totality. Its origin has been again and again explained, and, indeed, is as obvious as its spurious character. The Targum has not admitted it, nor the Syriac version, nor yet the Arabic, which inserts another

great authorities on the subject, and which are soon to appear in print.

* For the source of this quotation see the previous note. For an account of the principal lost manuscripts see Strack, ‘Prolog,’ pp. 15–29. We may here add that, as regards the ‘Talmudic Baraita on the Canon,’ a very interesting brochure has lately appeared by G. A. Marx, ‘Trad. Rabbin. Veterima de libr. V. Test. Ord. atque Orig.’ We add that existing Hebrew Biblical manuscripts are divided into such as are used in synagogues, unpointed, on parchment or leather rolls; and private manuscripts, written in book form, pointed, and with more or less of the Massor. Appar. They are commonly the work of several copyists.

gloss ; and although the Vulgate reproduces it, it is in slightly altered form. Ewald rejects it,* and even Thenius regards it as corrupted. What, then, could have induced the Revisers to give it a place ? Absolutely silly is the Septuagint reading inserted in the margin of 1 Sam. i. 5 : ‘ Unto Hannah ‘ he gave a single portion, because she had no child ; nevertheless Elkanah loved, &c.’ The Targum renders as in the Authorised Version ; the Syriac and Arabic translate ‘ double ; ’ so does Gesenius. The expression is no doubt a difficult one, but even Böttcher† rejects what he calls the glossary reading of the Septuagint, and we have to go to Wellhausen for its acceptance. As we have 1 Sam. i. open before us, we may as well notice one of those meddling changes which are so provoking, as not only needless but marring the impressiveness of the original. In her pathetic and beautiful reply to Eli’s reproof, Hannah is made to say (i. 16) in the Authorised Version : ‘ Out of the abundance of my complaint ‘ and grief have I spoken hitherto,’ for which the Revisers now bid us read : ‘ Out of the abundance of my complaint ‘ and my provocation have I spoken hitherto.’ But this would introduce an element into Hannah’s prayer, for which there is no warrant in the original. In Deut. xxxii. 27 Gesenius renders the word by *agritudo*, and Ewald‡ translates it ‘ wrath ’ with the explanation ‘ against him,’ while our Revisers there once more amend the Authorised Version from ‘ wrath ’ to ‘ provocation ’ (perhaps in more than the one sense). In the margin of Prov. xxi. 19, the Revisers have rendered the word by ‘ vexation,’ leaving in the text the indefensible translation (although adopted by Gesenius), ‘ A contentious and fretful woman.’ The true meaning is, ‘ A contentious woman and anger,’ viz., caused thereby. Lastly, in Prov. xvii. 25 the Revisers have rightly retained for this word the rendering of the Authorised Version, ‘ grief.’ But in return they have had the satisfaction of making in the previous verse one of those slight alterations which not only mar a saying but well-nigh deprive it of meaning. The Authorised Version had, ‘ Wisdom is before him that hath ‘ understanding,’ which only required to be reversed in the order of its words, as in the original, to show its meaning, and to bring out the full antithesis in the other member of the verse. ‘ Before him that hath understanding is wisdom ’

* Gesch. 3rd ed. vol. ii. p. 586.

† Exeget. Ahrenl. i. p. 85.

‡ Lehrb. 286 b.

—that is, he directs his attention and aim to it; on which follows the antithesis, ‘but the eyes of a fool are in the ends of the earth’—that is, his attention is diverted from the one main thing to all kinds of objects far away. What had not been clearly conveyed in the Authorised Version loses alike its true meaning and its force, if not its sense, through this literalism of the Revised Version, ‘Wisdom is ‘before the face of him that hath understanding.’ For what the writer intended to convey is, not that wisdom *is* before the face of him that hath understanding, which in a sense would be equally true in regard to the fool, but that the former sets his face towards it, looks at it, that in this sense it is before him, while the eyes of a fool wander after all manner of things in the ends of the earth. In general we may here remark that in Gnomology, especially in that of the Hebrews, so much depends on the collocation of the words that we could have wished the Revisers had more uniformly restored that of the original. And, viewing it as a whole, we venture to express the opinion that, both for the clearer understanding and the more correct rendering of it, the ‘revised’ Book of Proverbs urgently requires fresh revision. Nor could we recommend to the student better assistance in it than the lately published commentary of Nowack.*

The obtrusive recurrence of needless and disturbing emendations has accidentally led to this digression from our strictures on the inapt introduction into the margin of Septuagint readings. A cursory glance along the margin of the first Book of Samuel will convince, that it requires a peculiar critical disposition to accept many of them either as representing the genuine text or as entitled to their place of honour. And since, unfortunately, we cannot have the revised version without the margin, a careful examination may here be recommended. It will prove instructive, if not useful. But if we have too many of these emendations, there are others which ought not to have been omitted. In 1 Sam. xiii. 1 we have, indeed, the rectification, ‘Saul was ‘[*thirty*] years old,’ while in 2 Sam. viii. 13 we have the conveniently vague marginal note to the word ‘Aram’ [‘from ‘smiting of the Syrians’]: ‘According to some ancient ‘authorities, Edom.’ What ‘ancient authorities’ are here alluded to? and is it not rather likely that a short sentence

['and he smote Edom'] has here fallen out of the text? But since the easy misreading of 'Aram' for 'Edom,' which depends on the minute difference between a γ and a τ , is admitted, why not have marked it in the margin to 2 Chron. xx. 2, where for 'Syria' we must certainly read 'Edom'? The correction is supported by manuscript authority, and seems implied in the Syriac and Arabic versions, which have 'from the remote region of the Red Sea.' Besides, it is not only required by v. 10, but the text as it stands would involve the geographical absurdity that a great multitude from Syria had come against Jehoshaphat 'from beyond the sea.' On the other hand, if the authority of the Septuagint be absolutely required by the Revisers for making a marginal alteration, why has no notice of any kind been taken of the Septuagint reading in Ex. xii. 40? There can be no question that if any text required either explanation or correction, it is the statement in Ex. xii. 40 which seems to fix the stay of the children of Israel in Egypt at 430 years. This is not only incompatible with other historical notices in the Old Testament, but with the account of St. Stephen in Acts vii. 6, and the reference of St. Paul in Gal. iii. 17. The latter two notices at least prove that at the time of Christ the Jews had a different reading of the text. The following is that of the Samaritan Pentateuch and of the Septuagint: 'Now the sojourning of the children of Israel' [Samar. and Alex. 'and of their fathers'] 'which they sojourned in Egypt and in the land of Canaan' [in the Samar. this order is reversed] 'was four hundred and thirty years.' It is one of the most important readings, and by every rule of their own the Revisers were bound to mention it. So far as we know, reference is made to it in every Commentary. Knobel controverts but does not suppress it. It is the reading of Josephus,* of Mechilta,† Targum Pseudo-Jon., Seder Olam R., Ber. R.‡ and of a host of other 'ancient authorities,' patristic and Rabbinic. It is inserted among the 'Various Readings' in that excellent work the 'Variorum Teacher's Bible,' edited by Drs. Cheyne and Driver. We should like to know why it has been omitted from the margin of the Revised Version. Surely not because it does not occur in the Syriac and in Onkelos?

We feel tempted to select another instance where the Revisers have not noticed a reading in the Septuagint. It

* Ant. ii. 15, 2.

† Ed. Weiss. p. 19 a, b.

‡ 63, ed. Warsch. p. 113 b.

will also illustrate to what questions an apparently very slight alteration may give rise. In 2 Chron. xxxii. 32, the writer refers for 'the rest of the acts of Hezekiah' to what 'is written in the vision of Isaiah . . . and in the book of the kings of Judah and Israel.' The word 'and' is not in the Hebrew, but it is supplied in the Septuagint (also in the Vulgate, the Targum and the Arabic, though not in the Syriac). The Revisers take not even a marginal notice of this, but, omitting the word 'and,' render: 'in the vision of Isaiah . . . in the book of Kings . . .', thus conveying the impression that this vision of Isaiah was incorporated 'in the book of the kings.' But this is not the view of some critics, nor, as the insertion of the word 'and' proves, that of the Septuagint. In fact, it has even been suggested that the composition of the pseudepigraphic 'Ascensio Isaiaë' may be traced to this word 'and,' the pseudepigraphic work professing to supply the lost 'vision of Isaiah.' In any case, not unimportant critical questions are connected with this little word 'and,' and the reading was certainly much more deserving of record in the margin than such additions as that to 1 Sam. vi. 19, where it would have been more profitable to insert in the margin the strong doubts attaching to the numeral 'fifty thousand men,'* or than the explanatory gloss added to 2 Sam. iv. 6, and much else to which one is tempted to apply the somewhat disrespectful epithet of 'rubbish.'

These strictures are not advanced by way of exhaustive criticism of this part of the revision work, which, indeed, would have been impossible in this place. They are given as illustrative instances in support of that which is our strongest objection to the general use of this Revision. More than to the numberless minute and worrying changes introduced, which sometimes needlessly wound religious susceptibilities; more than to renderings which have been left uncorrected, and new renderings which make the meaning of the original more obscure than it had been; almost more even than to alterations which certainly are not improve-

* On the critical grounds for the omission of this impossible numeral the reasoning of Kennicott seems conclusive. As we are referring to 1 Sam. vi. 19, we may as well notice that the Revisers rightly adopt in v. 18 the emendation of \aleph into ι , whereby the meaningless 'Abel' becomes 'a stone.' But what can be the object of translating in the margin '*Abel—that is, a meadow*'? Will this enlighten or bewilder the general reader?

ments—more than to any or all of these we object to the margin of the Revised Version. It is absolutely fatal to the substitution of the new for the old Authorised Version. We do not now refer to the greatly increased cost involved in the margin, although this is of practical importance in such a work. But the first question which must occur to every one is: for whom the Revisers could have intended this 'margin'—unless, indeed, for themselves, by way of safety-valve. Those who know something of Hebrew criticism do not require most of the information supplied, nor will they feel grateful for what is neither novel nor complete. On the other hand, those who do *not* know anything of the subject cannot possibly be benefited by most of what is offered to them in that miscellaneous assortment, although some may be seriously, though needlessly, inconvenienced by certain parts of its contents. Generally speaking, these may be arranged under three classes. The first of them consists of a partial selection of various readings, some being variations in the Massoretic text, while the great majority are derived from the Septuagint or other ancient versions. The second class of notes furnishes a literal translation of certain Hebrew expressions. The third and largest class supplies alternative renderings. When the requisite majority of two-thirds could not be secured for a different rendering, the minority was driven to, or allowed, the relief of the margin. And conversely, perhaps by way of general quieting and in the interest of charity, the old rendering was often not altogether dismissed, but pensioned off by being given a dwelling-place in the margin. Alternately it seems as if the liberal or the orthodox party in this 'Coalition Company' were being admitted to the text or relegated to the cold shadow of the margin. In each case we mark only the results, but know nothing of what had led to them, interesting and certainly curious as the history would be.

Thus much for the three constituent elements in the margin. We proceed briefly to comment on each of them. As regards the first class of marginal suggestions—those derived from other versions—illustrative instances have already been given, sufficient at least to show that in this respect the new margin contains both too much and too little. It will scarcely be maintained that everything has been inserted that deserved critical consideration; nor that all that has been omitted was undeserving examination; nor yet that

the selection made precisely represents what one would submit to general readers of the Bible as alone worthy their knowledge. Then, what was the principle on which the selection was made, and was it agreed on by a two-thirds majority, or otherwise? Once more we have to ask for whom this selection of readings can have been intended. Certainly not for the benefit of students, and as certainly not for readers ignorant of criticism, since they have not the means of testing what, being placed in the margin, seems offered only as a suggestion, nor yet any knowledge of the arguments by which either one or the other reading may be supported or controverted.

The second class of marginal notations gives a literal translation of some Hebrew expressions. The general reader will derive little knowledge or comfort from the information here supplied to him, and the selection made is partial and arbitrary. Occasionally, though rarely, the literal translation of a Hebraism may bring out the beauty or the force of the original; but it is impossible to reproduce the peculiar genius of any language, especially an Eastern one, by a literal rendering of its phraseology. The attempt would often end in turning its pictorial realism into what sounds grotesque and ridiculous. You cannot reproduce the Hebrew modes of expression without transporting yourself into their modes of thinking. No reverent or sane person would think of literally translating some of the anthropomorphisms applied to the Divine Being; nor yet do even our terms 'father,' 'son,' 'daughter,' or 'master' give any adequate idea of what is sometimes conveyed by their Hebrew equivalents. True, the words: 'God shall keep her, and that right early,' is beautifully illustrated by the Hebrew, 'at the dawn of morning;' and this, 'My soul waiteth upon God,' by the marginal note, in the Authorised and Revised Versions: 'is silent unto 'God.' But nothing can be gained by adding to the expression 'the mighty man,' the marginal note: 'Hebr. *the man of arm,*' while it borders on the ridiculous when, in Eccles. x. 11, the word 'charmer' (of serpents) is presumably to be made more clear by the marginal rendering of the Hebrew, 'master of the tongue.' We fail to perceive what new idea the Hebrew conveys in this connexion; and if we are to have the English equivalent 'master' for the Hebrew word '*baal*,' why did the Revisers not similarly add, in 2 Kings i. 8, to the description of Elijah as 'an hairy man,' the marginal explanation, 'Hebr. *a man, master of hair,*' or to

that of 'the ram that had the two horns,'* 'Hebr. *the ram, master of the two horns*'?

If in this respect then much might be swept out of the margin, conversely words have been left untranslated which might in that form have been placed in the margin, while in the text some attempt was made at their rendering. For, surely, the object of this revision was, that the people might understand what is written, not that they may stumble over words exceedingly difficult of spelling. We do not like the Revisers' *Sheol*, but it is at least a word which, from its conjunction with *Hades*, conveys to most persons some definite idea. Not so *Abaddon*. And the difficulty is here increased by the different treatment which, to an unlearned reader, the word seems to receive from the Revisers. In Job xxvi. 6 we have in the same verse 'Sheol and Abaddon' in the text, and in the margin, respectively, 'or *the grave*,' 'or *destruction*.' As the expression 'or' indicates an alternative translation, some persons might infer that 'grave' and 'destruction' were such for 'Sheol' and 'Abaddon.' But two chapters later, in Job xxviii. 22, 'Abaddon' is rendered in the *text* by 'destruction,' the margin here not giving 'Abaddon' with an 'or' as an alternative rendering, but in this manner, 'Hebr. *Abaddon*,' which may imply that the word being difficult, its Hebrew equivalent is added. The same is the case in Job xxxi. 12, where, however, in the margin, we are referred back to xxvi. 6. No such back-reference was made in the analogous rendering of xxviii. 22. Similarly, in Ps. lxxxviii. 11, where we have 'destruction' in the text, and 'Hebr. *Abaddon*' in the margin, we are sent back to Job xxvi. 6 for instruction. But the mood is not constant, for in Prov. xv. 11 we have once more 'Sheol' and 'Abaddon' left untranslated in the text, with their respective 'or' in the margin, which is further confirmed in Prov. xxvii. 20 with simply a marginal reference to xv. 11. Assuredly, all this must seem very puzzling. Now *Abaddon*, which would be better translated 'the place of destruction,' is indeed one of the words of what are called 'the Wisdom-writings.' Presumably the Revisers left it untranslated where they wished to indicate that they regarded it as a kind of proper name. But this is a refinement absolutely unintelligible to the general reader. Even in their Commentaries, *Dillmann* (on Job) and *Delitzsch* (on Ps. lxxxviii.) make no such distinction, but always give the German

* Dan. viii. 6.

equivalent for the word. Nor will the general reader derive any comfort from the substitution of the word 'Nephilim,' in Gen. vi. 4, for the 'giants' of the Authorised Version, who are relegated into the margin with a prefatory 'or,' and the somewhat futile direction 'see Numb. xiii. 33,' where, as regards the meaning of the term, exactly the same is to be seen as in Gen. vi. 4. Kalisch regards the passage in Numbers as rendering 'certain' the meaning 'giants,' and he is supported by the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch, of the Septuagint, the Syriac, and Onkelos, although the Revisers take no notice of these 'ancient authorities.' Consistently enough, they have left us the 'Gammadim' of Ezek. xxvii. 11, where the 'valorous men' of the margin should have been transferred into the text, while in Is. xv. 5 they have added to the sorrows of the reader the unpronounceable 'Eglath-shelishiyah,' which, if it be the name of a place, means 'the third Eglath;' while, if it is to be rendered as in the new margin, it should, as in the Authorised Version, not have been prefaced by an 'or.'

But our strongest objection lies to that third and most numerous class in the margin, which furnishes alternative translations. These embrace, besides such of the former renderings of the Authorised Version as have now been remitted to a kind of *Hôtel des Invalides*, a large number that are new, some of which critical students would gladly see in the text, while not a few should never have found a place either in the text or the margin. Instances of the latter kind recur so frequently, that a selection is not easy. But, quite irrespective of critical discussions, there is one very serious aspect of these alternative renderings in the new margin. In ordinary instances these variants would only have a bewildering effect on the unprofessional reader, who can have no rational grounds for choosing the one rather than the other. But there are passages on the understanding of which the distinctive teaching of the Old Testament in its bearing on the New has hitherto been supposed to rest. We should make no complaint if the Revisers had felt it necessary so to alter their rendering as to make their previously supposed application impossible. Whatever the seeming loss, it would have been a gain to the cause of truth. But what we have a right to complain of is, that our scholars speak with 'a double,' 'treble,' or 'fourfold' voice. They say one thing in the text, and presently the opposite in the margin, only to correct themselves once more, and yet a third time. A sentence cannot have three different meanings, all incompatible with

each other. To add to the puzzle, the variants are severally introduced by the word 'or.' Yet they should have been more truthfully prefaced by 'on the contrary.' To test the comparative value of these minority and sub-minority renderings, some critical discussion would be required. But not a hint nor a help to that effect is given. They are simply placed side by side, not even introduced, as in the 'Teacher's Variorum Bible,' with the names of the critical authorities by whom they are supported. How are readers, ignorant of Hebrew and innocent of German criticism, to make their choice between these conflicting opinions? Are they to be guided by what seems orthodox, or else by what is heterodox? Who are right: the majority that speaks one thing in the text, or the minority which whispers another in the margin, or the sub-minority to which we owe yet a third variation? When doctors so differ, what are laymen to do? Probably the popular inference would be, not that these theological doctors represented different schools of critical treatment, but that everything was in doubt. Either the Hebrew text or the Hebrew wording, or both, must be of uncertain meaning. In either case, what had hitherto been understood of the teaching of the Old Testament could no longer be relied upon. We hasten to add that such conclusions are wrong, because no such doubts attach to the text of the Old Testament, however it may be subject to critical discussion. But, if unwarranted, such inferences are at any rate natural. The consequences which they are likely to involve all would deplore. But, besides this very serious aspect, there is something ludicrously self-contradictory in a Revised Version which revises itself without yet being revised; which was intended to make everything clear, and only makes it clear that what is most important is quite dark; a new authorised version which does not authorise, and seems alternately to speak with the voice and to offer the hands of Jacob or Esau. Is this to be the new 'People's Bible;' to become the authoritative source of the future religious learning of the people? To such considerations, which every thoughtful man, whatever his religious opinions, must feel to be serious, it would be no manner of answer that we propose sacrificing truth to orthodoxy. Assuredly, we propose nothing of the kind. By all means, if it be truth, let it be spoken out, whatever the consequences. But then the Revisers have not spoken it out, nor yet declared it truth. On their own showing it is so doubtful, that the majority adopt one view and the minority another. But a book

destined for the religious teaching of the people is not the place for witnessing exegetical tournaments, or chronicling the results of different critical schools, still less for diffusing around some of the most important points an atmosphere of uncertainty and agnosticism.

We do not for a moment suggest that such consequences were present to the mind of the Revisers; but then they should have been present to them. No doubt they simply recorded the results of their discussions, in which, as they tell us, each verse had separately to run the gauntlet of all kinds of critical opinion, as one would expect in a Commentary. But they forgot that they were not writing a Commentary, but revising the Authorised Version for popular use. It is another question, with which we are not at present concerned, whether the Revisers from the first adopted the best plan for their work, or whether it would not have been wiser to entrust special books to sub-committees (as had been the case when the Authorised Version was made), and then to submit the result to the whole Company, or, if needful, even to a wider circle. For the present we have to vindicate the strong opinion we have expressed, rather than criticise the method adopted by the Revisers. Only a few illustrative instances can be given; but it would not be difficult greatly to multiply them if the inquiry were to be prosecuted.

In Gen. xlix. 10, the Revisers retain in the text the old rendering 'until Shiloh come.' But in the margin we have no less than three variants, all of them differing from each other, and, except the third, not easily compatible with the rendering in the text, which implies a prophetic reference to the Messiah. The first marginal 'or' has it: 'till he 'come to Shiloh having the obedience of the peoples.' This is the view of Dillmann, and substitutes a reference to the past history of Judah for a prophecy of Christ.* The

* Impossible as the explanation of Delitzsch seems to us (Mess. Proph. p. 34), 'until he come to Shiloh, and to him will be the obedience of peoples,' it is still Messianic, since the meaning attached to it by Delitzsch is, that Judah's 'leadership of the tribes' 'will 'ultimately be extended to the government of the world. On the other hand, the view of Dillmann, and the first 'or' of the Revisers, limit the prediction to the time when the tribe of Judah came to Shiloh 'having the obedience of the peoples,' although Dillmann's 'of peoples' (without the definite article) points to heathen nations, whereas the Revisers' 'of the peoples' might leave this open to doubt (comp. the new margin to Deut. xxxiii. 3). Dillmann refers it to the subjection of the Canaanite races, gained by the wars under the

second 'or' of the Revisers has it, 'until that which is his 'shall come.' This appears with a recommendation from the Septuagint, but has many and most weighty reasons against it. Even less can be said in favour of the third variant introduced as 'another ancient rendering: '* 'till 'he come whose it is.'† Whatever translation be given of the word *Shiloh*, the Messianic application of the verse is supported by a whole *catena* of ancient Jewish interpretation, which the curious reader will find in the second volume of Schöttgen's '*Horæ Hebr.*' pp. 145-146. But, for our present argument, we are not so much concerned with the correct rendering of this verse as with the variety which the Revisers offer to the people in their new Bible. Including the text, we have the choice of four different renderings. Which of these shall it be; and why this and not that; or shall it be neither; or is it all uncertain and undeterminable?

We pass to another well-known passage. In Ps. ii. 12, the Revisers retain in the text the Messianic rendering, 'Kiss the Son,' although they make it needlessly offensive by printing 'son' (both here and in v. 7) with a small 's.' We say needlessly, since the rendering in the text implies the Messianic application, which is that of the New Testament. But, once more, it is not so much with the translation of the verse that we are now concerned—for which we refer to the classical Commentary of Delitzsch—as with the addition in the margin of the two, or rather three, variants 'from ancient versions.' In the text we read as before:

leadership of Judah, and thinks that it points to some occasion, posterior to that mentioned in Josh. xviii. 9, and the subsequent wars, when Judah and the other tribes gathered in *Shiloh*. What the authors of the first revised 'or' had in view it is not for us to say. An interesting and exhaustive article on this prophecy from the pen of Dr. Driver, one of the Revisers, has just appeared in the '*Journal of Philology*' (No. 27). We may add that, although a satisfactory explanation of the word *Shiloh* may be difficult, this does not affect the Messianic application of it. And perhaps it is best to leave it untranslated, and regard it as a designation rather than a name.

* The Revisers might have given as their third variant more than 'another ancient rendering.' There are, in fact, three slightly different renderings: Aquila and Sym. have 'to whom it is reserved; ' Onkelos and the Jer. Targ., 'the king Messiah, whose is the kingdom; ' and the Syriac, 'he whose it is.' (Comp. Dillmann, *ad loc.*).

† The third variant is really not supported by Ezek. xxi. 27 (in the Hebr. 32), since we have in that sentence a subject ('whose right 'it is') the absence of which renders variants 2 and 3 impossible.

‘Kiss the son.’ In the margin we have, ‘Lay hold of (or, ‘Receive) instruction,’ and as yet another variant, ‘Worship ‘in purity.’ Thus we have here four entirely different translations of one of the most important passages. For which of these is the reader to decide, and on what grounds is he to make his choice? Still less excuse exists for the two variants to the text of Ps. xxii. 16, where, if anywhere, the greatest caution should have been exercised. To the rendering in the text, ‘they pierced my hands and my feet,’ the Revisers add in the margin: ‘So the Septuagint, Vulgate, and Syriac.’ As they were about it, they might have added the Arabic, Æthiopian, and Coptic—in short, with slight exception, all ancient versions. But these exceptions must be alluded to by the Revisers when in their first variant they tell us, ‘according to other ancient versions, ‘they bound.’ We presume they refer here to Aquila and Symmachus, although even thus the state of the case is not quite accurately presented, since in the first edition of his work Aquila had ‘they put to shame or made ugly,’ and only in the second ‘they bound.’ The next variant of the Revisers is: ‘The Hebrew text as printed reads, *Like a lion.*’ In the letter of it this is strictly true, but also extremely misleading to the general reader. The obvious inference would be that if the Massoretic text were honestly translated, the rendering would not be ‘they pierced my hands ‘and my feet,’ nor even ‘they bound;’ in fact no verb at all, but the substantive, ‘like a lion.’ We will not refer to what must be obvious to all, that to translate ‘like a ‘lion’ would not give sense, and besides requires that a verb should be supplied. But the variant of the Revisers leaves the reader in ignorance of the following important facts. 1. That *all* the versions, even Aquila and Symmachus, had read the word as a verb, and hence could not have known the meaning which the Revisers attach to ‘the Hebrew text as pointed,’ nor yet read ‘like a lion.’* 2. That the reading of the word as a verb (of which the suggested rendering, ‘they bound,’ is most unlikely) is consistent with the Massoretic text, taking the word as the participle in the plural (*fodientes*), with apocope of the final ן; while the same sense is obtained by a somewhat different vocalisation, for which there is manuscript authority. 3. That the Massorah itself tells us that in the two places in which the expression occurs (here, and in Is.

* The Targum (*mordent sicut leo*) ‘*schwankt*,’ as Delitzsch says.

xxxviii. 13, where it can only mean 'like a lion') it has two different significations, and thus itself attests that the word should be taken as a verb. 4. That there is a different reading of it (*kaaru*, not to speak of *karu*), the rendering of which is 'they pierced,' and which is supported by the Massorah on Numb. xxiv. 9,* by manuscripts, and by the attestation of Jacob ben Chayyim in the *Massora finalis*, on the authority of a manuscript Kethibh by the side of the Qeri.

The reader who would pursue the subject further must be referred to the last edition of Delitzsch's 'Commentary,' † and to the critical note in the 'Speaker's Commentary.' ‡ For our present purpose it suffices to show that on this most important passage the marginal variant of the Revisers says either too much or too little. In any case the threefold rendering presented in the Revised Version must have a most confusing effect, especially as in this instance the Revisers have not indicated their own views. Their marginal remarks are not prefaced by the usual 'or,' and we are left in doubt whether one or both of the variants are suggested by a minority, or else the Revisers are only desirous to place certain critical facts at the disposal of the general public, allowing them to draw for themselves such inferences as perchance they may be able to do.

We are greatly tempted to pursue this analysis further. But to make it complete would require far more than the space at our command; and the illustrative instances given will sufficiently prove that, irrespective of anything else, the margin of the Revisers would itself constitute a fatal objection to their work. § But there are other and very grave exceptions to it.

Before stating these, it is a pleasing duty to mark the

* We are aware that another notice in the Massorah is inconsistent with this.

† We are aware that Hengstenberg, who takes the Messianic view of the Psalm, both adopts and defends the rendering 'like a lion.'

‡ Vol. iv. pp. 223, 224.

§ It is no manner of answer to this objection that the margin of the Authorised Version also contains a number of variants, for (1) these are of a different character; (2) they have not a bewildering effect in the sense in which we have used the expression; (3) one of the main objects of the Revised Version was, we should have imagined, to render such variants unnecessary by giving the real meaning of the original where, to their predecessors, it seemed doubtful, or at least, to reduce their number to the smallest dimension.

improvement effected by the arrangement of the Psalter in its five books, and, in general, of the poetical portions in lines which exhibit the parallelism of Hebrew poetry. Personally, we do not feel so sure of the grouping of the other portions in paragraphs instead of chapters and verses. The impression of frequently a whole column without a break is not pleasant to the eye, while it renders quotation or reference more difficult. In regard to verbal alterations there can be no doubt of the absolute gain of such changes as 'tent of meeting' for 'tabernacle of congregation,' 'meal offering' for 'meat offering,' 'nations' for 'Gentiles' and 'heathens,' and even the introduction of the somewhat harsh 'peoples.' These and many others must be added to the long list of substantial corrections for which every reader of the Bible will feel grateful. And yet here also it must be our unwelcome task to show that this revision cannot take the place of the Authorised Version. For, on the one hand, the Revisers have left errors that should certainly have been corrected, and obscurities that might have been removed, or at least not been rendered still more obscure. On the other hand, the Revisers are in glaring contradiction with their own first rule and principle, which is 'to introduce as few alterations as possible into the text of the Authorised Version consistently with faithfulness.' Only those who have made comparison can form any conception how very large is the number of alterations made—many utterly needless, some confusing and even wholly unwarranted.

To estimate the changes made by the Revisers it is necessary, in the first place, to take a survey of them. We have before us a series of tables in which all the alterations made in certain of the books of the Old Testament have been noted, grouped, classified, and numbered. The books so examined have been Genesis, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, Psalms, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Besides these, every alteration has also been noted in Job, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. But time and patience have failed for grouping and numbering them. Even in those that have been classified and numbered the plan followed has been a somewhat rough-and-ready one. All changes have been grouped under four columns: those merely of wording, construction, and the like; unimportant changes; important changes; and very important changes. But as views on what may be important or very important are so likely to differ, we have, in the summary which we are about to present, added together the 'important' and 'very im-

'portant' changes, and again, the 'unimportant' changes and those which may be regarded as chiefly of wording and construction. Thus we have only two instead of four columns. Even so there may be frequent differences of opinion, and some may be disposed to regard as important what we have marked as unimportant changes, and perhaps *vice versâ*, although the latter certainly less frequently. Generally speaking, the arrangement has been made from the standpoint of the general reader, alterations being marked as important where the new version would convey to the mind of such readers a wholly or greatly differing meaning from that which they had derived from the old Bible. Still further, certain of the books have been more carefully numbered than others. Thus, in Psalms, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, the changes under each group have been severally counted in every verse, although where an important change had been made in a verse or clause it was not deemed necessary to count the minor changes which it involved. But in Genesis, Judges, Ruth, the two books of Samuel, and Isaiah, only the changed verses themselves have been ranged under each group, without counting all the actual alterations under each group made in a verse. Thus a given verse would be only once marked under 'unimportant changes,' although two or three such might occur in it; or only once under 'important changes,' although all its clauses had been altered.* In other words, in the one case the number of changes in the verses have been tabulated and counted, in the other only the verses changed. The result is that the number of actual changes is, in reality, much larger than the sum total which we shall present under each column. But this is evidently an element in favour of our computation. Perhaps, however, we may plead for some indulgence in case, despite the most earnest care, some trifling mistake has occurred in casting up so many numerals.†

We begin with those books where only the verses changed, not the changes under each group in every verse, have been arranged and numbered. In the *Book of Genesis* the total number of changes in verses under the various groups amounts in all to 820, of which only 220 are marked as

* But a verse might be counted three times if it contained an unimportant, an important, and a very important alteration.

† Our summary refers only to alterations in the text, and no notice of any kind has been taken of the margin.

‘important,’ and very few as ‘very important.’ In *Judges* there are altogether 531 such changes, of which only 104 are marked as important. In *Ruth* there are 56 such changes, only 3 being marked as likely to impress a general reader as of importance. In 1 *Samuel* there are 548 verse-changes, only 85 being marked as of importance; in 2 *Samuel* 531, with only 89 of importance; while, lastly, in the *Book of Isaiah* the number of verse-changes alone amounts to no less than 1,202, of which 334 are marked as of importance. Total number of verse-changes in these six books: 3,688, of which 835 are marked as important.

Before proceeding we must, to prevent misunderstanding, repeat our twofold caution. A verse or clause may be completely changed and yet be only counted as one change, because all the changes are under one group. Thus Judg. v. 13, is only marked as one change, because the many alterations in it are all under the same group. Again, many changes have been marked as ‘unimportant’ which others might regard as very important. Thus, in the story of Jephthah’s vow (Judg. xi.) the changes ‘she had not ‘known man’ for ‘she knew not man’ (v. 39), and ‘the ‘daughters of Israel went yearly to celebrate’ instead of ‘to lament’ the daughter of Jephthah, slight as they are, might to some seem to convey that it was certain the maiden had been offered as a sacrifice—a point which the Authorised Version leaves open. Nevertheless, these changes have been marked as ‘unimportant’ because in themselves slight, and because the general reader may scarcely notice them, or, in the judgement of charity, not draw from them the same inferences. Thus our computation errs in every respect on the side of charity.

We hasten to add the results reached in those three books where mostly every alteration in a verse has been counted. In the prophecies of *Jeremiah* 1,278 changes have been marked, 116 among them as important; in the prophecies of *Ezekiel* 1,550 changes, 82 of them as important; lastly, in the *Book of Psalms*, 2,094 changes, 430 of them as important. The grand total of these three books is 4,922 changes, among them 628 marked ‘important.’ The total of the nine books analysed gives 8,610 changes, of which only 1,462 have been marked as important.

The first impression made by these numerals will probably be that of the immense labour and care bestowed by the Revisers; the next, that of the very great number of changes made; and the third, that of the disproportion between those

unimportant and those important. In the above computation only about a sixth of the many changes have been marked as important. Suppose we were greatly to increase that proportion, say to one-fourth, it would still leave three-fourths of all the changes as unimportant. We are willing to admit that some of these unimportant changes may have the effect of reproducing the original meaning either more correctly or more clearly and forcibly. But after making the widest allowance for all this, there remains a very large number of alterations which must be described as needless, and therefore useless. It is surely mere purism to change in Gen. x. 22, 23, and xlix. 8, 'children' into 'sons;' while conversely 'sons' is changed into 'children' in Gen. xxiii. 3, 20, where 'sons' is really the better word, although, with curious inconsistency, in the middle of the same narrative (v. 11) the word 'sons' is left unchanged. In 1 Sam. xxxi. 4, and in Is. xxxvii. 6, xxxviii. 1, 'unto' becomes changed into 'to,' and conversely 'to' into 'unto' in Judg. x. 12, Is. xxxvi. 7, xlii. 17. In Judg. ii. 15, iii. 9, 31, where the reference is to human help, the Revisers have substituted 'saved' for 'delivered,' when the latter certainly seems the more appropriate word; while in 1 Sam. xi. 13, and xix. 5, where the reference is to God, they have changed 'salvation' into 'deliverance,' and in the second passage into 'victory,' these changes being the more startling that in both cases they have put into the margin '*Hebr. salvation.*' There may be meaning in the change of 'have given' to 'gave' (Gen. xvi. 5), 'poured' for 'have poured' (1 Sam. i. 15), or 'spake' for 'hath spoken' (Is. xvi. 13); but little good can be got from altering 'did strive' into 'strove' (Gen. xxvi. 2), or 'womenservants'—which is surely here the more appropriate word—into 'maidservants' (Gen. xxxii. 5), and, still more strangely, 'womenservants' in Gen. xxxii. 22 into 'handmaids,' when those referred to are Zilpah and Bilhah, both of them mothers of Jacob's children. We have a very large list of similar alterations, such as 'finished' for 'ended' (Gen. ii. 2), 'hallowed' for 'sanctified' (Gen. ii. 3), 'forasmuch as' instead of 'because that' (Gen. xxxviii. 26), 'rule' for 'reign' (Judg. ix. 2), 'vale' for 'valley' (1 Sam. xvii. 19; xxi. 9), 'withholden' for 'kept back' (1 Sam. xxvi. 34), 'coming up' for 'ascending' (1 Sam. xxviii. 13), 'bowed' for 'stooped' (1 Sam. xxviii. 14), 'remain' for 'be left' (Is. xi. 4), 'made ready' for 'prepared' (Is. xxx. 33). Even the horse is no longer allowed by the Revisers (in Job xxix. 25) to snort 'Ha, ha,'

but is made, like human beings, to say 'Aha!' But we forbear, lest in turn the charge of petty objections be raised against us. We have also a list of what, to the uninitiated, would seem needless alterations in the structure of sentences, which we similarly suppress. But surely the ordinary rules of grammar need not have been 'revised' as in this sentence: 'Where is thy zeal and thy mighty acts' (Is. lxiii. 15).

We pass to objections of a more serious character. So many exceptions to special renderings have been taken by other reviewers that we hesitate to add to their number. And it is a most ungrateful and distasteful task to look out for exceptions where there is so much that calls for warm acknowledgement. But once more we have to remember that this revision is intended to take the place of the Authorised Version. It is from this point of view that we have to state some obvious objections to it. Once more we can only give a few illustrative instances. In their Preface the Revisers inform us that they have adopted the rule of substituting 'its' for 'his' where the former would now be used. But in that case it must appear strange, and to the uninitiated inexplicable, that 'his' and 'him' should have been retained in the text of Gen. iv. 7 ('unto thee shall be his desire,' &c.), while the margin rightly substitutes 'its' and 'it.' It is true that the Hebrew, by a beautiful figure, here represents sin (in the Hebrew feminine) as a beast of prey crouching (would this not have been better than 'coucheth'?), and therefore proceeds to use the masculine. But as this is not brought out in the translation, the Revisers should not have corrected 'his' and 'him,' but, following the example of Kalisch, have left 'its' and 'it.' This, however, is a trifling oversight as compared with the extraordinary designation 'Dammesek Eliezer,' which they give to Abraham's servant in Gen. xv. 2 ('he that shall be possessor of my house is 'Dammesek Eliezer'). We are aware that Kalisch regards it 'as a proper name,' and appeals in support to the names 'Cushan-Rishathaim' (Judg. iii. 10) and 'Hadadezer' (2 Sam. viii. 3). But, as every one must see, the cases are not in any way parallel. True, the Septuagint translates as our Revisers and Kalisch, but then it also renders the previous words ('ben mesheq bethi') 'possessor of my house' by 'the 'son of Mesek my house-slave.' Dillmann (as also Ewald*) translates 'Damascus of Eliezer;' our own preference is for 'Damascus, Eliezer' (with a comma between the two). In

* Lehrb. 8th ed. p. 722.

the text a word-play and antithesis was evidently intended between the 'ben mesheq,' the future 'possessor' of Abraham's house, and 'Damascus' as represented by Eliezer: thus, the '*ben mesheq bethi*' shall be *Dammeseq* (Damascus), Eliezer,—i.e. Damascus in the person of Eliezer. But in any case what is a non-Hebraist reader to make of the untranslated '*Dammesek Eliezer*,' since, Eliezer being evidently the man's proper name, the other would naturally suggest itself only as an inversion of his family-name, as in Hungarian? And there are many similar occasions for misunderstanding to the unlearned in the new version. There is not, perhaps, a more difficult piece to translate, nor one on which more properly differences may obtain, than the song of Deborah. The rendering of the Revisers is no doubt a great improvement upon that of the Authorised Version, although some exceptions may be taken to it. But surely whatever Deborah may have meant, she would scarcely have assigned, even figuratively, to them out of Zebulun, 'the marshal's staff.'

But not only from the point of view of a general reader, from that also of the critical student, serious and well-grounded objection will be taken to the new rendering of Lev. xvi. 8, 10, 26. It is well known that the old translation of 'scapegoat' for the mysterious companion to the great sacrifice of the Day of Atonement was untenable. Almost equally impossible seems the ancient Jewish view which identified Azazel with the place whither the goat was led—a steep, inaccessible mountain*—or else regards it as referring to a wild, desert place.† As the derivations of Fürst (from *azaz* and *el*=*robur Dei*) and of Movers (*az* and *azal*=*fortis abiens*) must be set aside, there remain only the two views, that of regarding Azazel as the name of a demon, or of Satan (Spencer, '*De legg. Hebr.*,' and most moderns), or else as an appellative noun (formed from *azal*), either in the sense of 'for going away' or 'for removal' (the root-verb being taken either in the transitive or the intransitive signification), or not as an abstract but as a concrete noun with the signification of 'going far away' or 'far removed.'‡ The former of

* So also Deyling, '*Observ. S.*' i. pp. 84–99; Neubauer, '*Géogr. du Talm.*' p. 44.

† So Bochart, '*Hieroicoicon*,' lib. ii. c. liv. pp. 650–658 ('*azazel, recessus vel recessus, ut nos quidem putamus*'). Bochart gives the fullest account of early Jewish and other views.

‡ Comp. Volck in Herzog's '*Real-Encyk.*' 2nd ed. ii. p. 24.

these two views is expressed in the margin of the Revisers ('dismissal'), but does not seem so satisfactory as the second, according to which we must translate Lev. xvi. 8, 'For an *azazel*, i.e. as destined to be far removed, or going far away; v. 10, 'The goat on which the lot fell for an *azazel*' (as before) . . . i.e. to send him away as an *azazel*, in the sense already explained; and lastly, v. 26, 'He that letteth *go* the goat for an *azazel*, i.e. to be or become such. In any case this view of the meaning of *azazel* seems to underlie the rendering of the Septuagint, of Aquila, and Symmachus. But our Revisers have introduced into the text '*Azazel*' as a proper name, with a capital, although they have printed 'son' (Ps. ii.) and 'spirit of God' with small initials; and as for many reasons they could not have meant Satan, they must have intended to imply that this was the name of a demon. But the idea of imputing to the Mosaic legislation such a service of demons* is, even irrespective of the summary prohibition in Lev. xvii. 7, so utterly unhistorical, and so contrary to the whole of its spirit, as to rule it out of consideration. That the Revisers should in a 'People's Bible' have put into the text what to many will imply the sanction of homage to demons, when, to say the least, such a rendering is critically and historically opposed by such weighty considerations, would in itself constitute a fatal objection to the general introduction of the new version.

A similar objection attaches, though to a less degree, to the substitution in 2 Sam. viii. 18 (similarly in 2 Sam. xx. 26, 1 Kings iv. 5) of the word 'priest' for the former rendering 'chief ruler,' where critical opinion is at any rate divided, and where the parallel in 1 Chron. xviii. 17, and what we must still regard as a scholium, not an apposition, in 1 Kings iv. 5, are in favour of the old rendering. Here also most important questions as to the age of the Pentateuch and the primitive worship of Israel are connected with the translation. Quite extraordinary—indeed, more strange than any miracle—must have been the phenomenon which, according to the Revisers, the Benjamites witnessed when, on looking behind them, 'behold, the whole of the city went up in smoke *to* heaven' (Judg. xx. 40). The old rendering, if wanting the purism of the new—such as 'the whole of the city'—was at least not guilty of suggesting anything ridiculous, which in part would have been avoided by substituting for 'to'

* According to Wellhausen, Lev. xvi. formed part of the document which he designates as Q.

‘towards heaven.’ We might easily add a long list of passages which will give rise to misunderstanding. The correction of 2 Kings ii. 19, 21, is as misleading as was the Authorised Version. The text does not mean that ‘the land miscarrieth,’ but that, owing to the character of the water, there were frequent miscarriages in the country. The reference was not to the effect of the water upon the land but upon the death- and birth-rate of the district, as appears even from v. 21.* Similarly, without entering on the question whether or not the Massoretic reading is correct, the new rendering of Job xix. 26 robs it not only of beauty but almost of sense. Conceive in the opening verses of our Burial Service such words substituted as these: ‘And ‘after my skin has been thus destroyed, yet from my flesh ‘shall I see God.’ What is here the exact bearing of ‘*thus*,’ and what the meaning of seeing God ‘*from*’ one’s flesh; or is it to be inferred that after the ‘skin’ has been ‘thus’ destroyed, we are from our ‘flesh’ to see the Almighty? The rendering is, indeed, strictly literal, and the meaning of the Revisers may be learned from reading a Commentary. There it will be found that ‘*thus*’ means either ‘*this*,’ pointing to the body, or else ‘*in this manner*;’ and that ‘*from my flesh*’ means either ‘*without my flesh*,’ out of it, or else ‘*from my body*,’ in the same sense as the Authorised Version had translated ‘*in my flesh*.’ But, surely, the new version ought to be at least intelligible without a Commentary.

As we have referred to the Book of Job, we must here enter a strong protest against the substitution of the word ‘renounce’ for ‘curse’ in Job i. 5, 11, ii. 5, 9, as also in Ps. x. 3, although the Revisers have allowed the old rendering ‘curse’ to remain in the charge against Naboth (1 Kings xxi. 10): ‘Thou didst curse God and the King,’ only putting into the margin ‘or *renounce*.’ A careful comparison will show that in all the passages to which we have referred the expression can only have the same meaning as in 1 Kings xxi. 10. The word, which literally means ‘to bless,’ is a euphemism, such as is frequently used when something painful, of the opposite kind, has to be referred to. In the present instance the preferable equivalent would perhaps be ‘to utter ‘blasphemy or blasphemous language.’ In this sense the expression is used in Talmudic diction, and also in the Bible, as in 1 Kings xxi. 10, where the rendering ‘to blaspheme’

* Compare Thenius, *ad loc.*; Ewald, ‘Lehrb.’ p. 417.

or curse is not matter of doubt, such as might be noted in the margin, but rendered absolutely certain by the use of the parallel expression in Is. viii. 21, where the verb is not the euphemistic one of 1 Kings, but that which always means to blaspheme or to curse.* And in all the passages to which we have referred in Job (i. 5, 10, ii. 5, 9), as well as in Ps. x. 3, this rendering of the word alone gives the proper meaning.†

We must bring to a close our remarks on this class of alterations introduced by the Revisers. But we cannot do so without mentioning two instances, both of great importance, in which they have displaced what was doubtful by something that is at least equally doubtful, if not unwarrantable, or else signally out of taste and apt to mislead. To begin with the latter. In Ps. viii. 11 the Authorised Version had it, 'And God is angry *with the wicked* every day,' for which the Revisers bid us read, 'Yea, a God that hath indignation every day.' We prefer the old rendering 'and' to the new 'yea;' 'to be angry' and 'to have indignation' mean the same thing, while neither the one nor the other expression gives the real force of the original; and, lastly, the words in italics ('with the wicked') seem absolutely demanded by the context. But our chief objection to the revision is, that the new clause, taken by itself, would seem to give a representation of the Almighty, neither warranted by the original nor by the whole tenor of the Bible, and might furnish the average infidel orator with a text that might easily confound an illiterate audience. We proceed to give an instance of the displacement of one critically doubtful rendering, which on good grounds has become dear to many, by another at least equally doubtful. In Hagg. ii. 7, 'the desire of all nations' has been replaced by their 'desirable things,' to which at least quite as serious critical objection will be taken as to the old one, and that not from the orthodox side only.‡ Lastly, not only doubtful but purely hypothetical and unwarrantable is the change proposed in Mal. i. 11 from the predictive *future* to the descriptive *present*. Here the original equally admits the one and the other rendering;

* The revised marginal rendering of that verse, not that in their text, is the correct one. The אֲשֶׁר (אֲשֶׁר) marks the object. In 1 Kings and the other passages the euphemistic אֲשֶׁר is used.

† Compare the full discussion in the excursus by Wetzstein to Delitzsch's 'Comment. on the Psalms,' 4th ed. p. 886.

‡ See Kurzgef. Exeg. Handb. 4th ed. i. pp. 328, 329.

but the alteration made by the Revisers gives no sense, unless we were, with Lange, to understand the verse as meaning that God's name was at the time of Malachi known to and by the heathen, and their unconscious homage accepted (Rom. i. 21).

It would have been well if, instead of such changes, the Revisers had applied themselves to bring out the meaning of those difficult portions in the Old Testament which an attempt at literalism can only render more obscure than they had been. As we have previously referred to Prov. xvii., we may as well take our present illustration from the opening verses of Prov. xviii., which offer no real critical difficulty. In the Revised Version the first verse now reads:

'He that separateth himself seeketh his own desire,
And rageth against all sound wisdom.'

If this be 'sound wisdom,' others than separatists might be tempted to rage against it. What the verse really means, is, that he who pays no heed to the views of others, but follows his own course (separates himself), does so in pursuit of some wish of his own, and sets himself up (is angry) against all that is for the general weal.* In verse 2 the slight alterations made on the Authorised Version (which we have marked by italics) destroy every chance of understanding the meaning. The verse now reads:

'A fool hath no delight in understanding,
But *only* [A. V. *omit*] that his heart may *reveal* [A. V. *discover*] itself.'

Most persons would regard this as a very mysterious cause of delight. But if we translate: 'rather' (or 'but only') 'in 'the revealing itself of his heart'—that is, in that, in or by which his heart reveals itself, viz. that it is foolish—we have not only sense but a parallelism to Prov. xii. 23, xiii. 16, xv. 2. In verse 3 the revised version is no improvement, and the old punctuation only required to be altered as follows:

'When the wicked cometh, *then* cometh also contempt
And *along* with ignominy reproach,'

these being the three sequences of his coming. In verse 4 we should again prefer the Authorised Version, omitting the words there italicised and punctuating differently, as follows:

'The words of a man's mouth: deep waters,
A well-spring of wisdom, a flowing brook.'

* Nowack: 'Gegen Alles, was frommt, ereifert er sich.' This suits the context far better than the rendering of תושיה by *consilium* or *sapientia*. But what does *sound* wisdom mean—can wisdom be unsound?

Passing over verse 5—which in the second clause should be rendered as in the margin of the Revised Version and not as in its text—it would surely be difficult to guess that when in verse 6 we read concerning the fool :

‘ And his mouth calleth for stripes,’

the meaning is, not that his mouth is to be struck, but that the words of a fool bring stripes upon himself.

These and endless other misrenderings the Revisers might have avoided if they had made use of the excellent Commentary of Nowack. But the series of misconceptions becomes even more startling when we pass from Proverbs to Ecclesiastes. If our space had admitted, it was our wish and hope to submit the ‘revised version’ of the words of ‘The Preacher’ to detailed examination, verse by verse. As it is, we must again be content with illustrative instances. We cannot enter on the many important questions, well known to scholars, that are connected with this book. But to the difficulties of style and of the manner in which the reasoning is presented must here be added that of language, which is late Hebrew, as afterwards illustrated by the *Mishnah* and early Rabbinic writings. Nowack has given (at pp. 190, 191) a list of such forms and words, which might be increased. We proceed to a selection from our notes on the revised version of Ecclesiastes.

In Eccl. i. 4 the Authorised Version (‘One generation passeth away’) is in accordance with the whole drift of the reasoning, and expresses the meaning of the original far more truly than the Revised ‘goeth.’ The same remark applies to the interpretation of the same expression in Eccles. v. 15 and vi. 4. Indeed, throughout, it is this fatalistic view of things which underlies and explains the reasoning of the book. The Revisers have signally failed in apprehending it, and so, by their alterations, even where slight, have rendered it well nigh impossible to understand it.

Passing over a minor objection to the proposed rendering ‘full of weariness’ (verse 8), which is that of Zöckler, whom the Revisers too often follow, and where the meaning is that all things are in restless activity, we must point out that the proper translation of the second clause of verse 9 is, not ‘that which hath been done is that which will be done,’ but ‘that which has happened is that which will happen,’ since not only human deeds but all occurrences are here referred to. Once more the change here made by the Revisers may seem slight, but it affects the whole

reasoning of the book. Assuredly, the 'revision' is not an improvement.

Similarly, in verse 11 we prefer the italicised '*things*' of the Authorised Version to the 'generations' of the Revised, as including both men and events. Omitting verse 13, to which also we take exception, we should prefer translating in verse 14, 'all the events that take place' as being more general. That more than 'works done' is referred to, seems clearly implied in v. 15. Here we come for the first time on the extraordinary rendering, 'striving after wind,' in place of the old 'vexation of spirit.' We can understand the vivid figure of the pursuit of wind for an utterly hopeless search after something that escapes the grasp, but for this peculiar sensation of 'striving after wind' we are indebted to the Revisers who should not have so translated the rendering of Delitzsch. Indeed, 'striving after wind' is a clumsy, but not an accurate, reproduction of 'Streben nach Winde.'

We pass over minor objections to verses 16 and 18 to note that the Revised Version once more seems wholly to miss the point of the argument in chapter ii. The Preacher, having in his pursuit passed from wisdom to folly, but with the same want of success (ii. 1, 2), next proposes in ii. 3 to try a combination of the two. Accordingly *he searched* [perhaps determined] *in his heart* [mind, inner man] *to cheer his flesh with wine, while at the same time his heart guided itself with wisdom, and to lay hold on folly*, and so to test the result of this novel combination—but alas! with the result described in verse 11.

We regretfully leave aside the fresh train of thought beginning in chapter ii. 12, as well as the exceptions to the Revised Version which we had here noted. But we may be allowed in passing to remark that in ii. 26 we would prefer, as giving a good antithesis, to retain the Talmudic meaning of the verb *chush*, and to translate: 'Who can eat or who can feel pain without Him,' altering in the last word (with the Septuagint and the Syriac) the 'into' into 'into'.

* But what can have induced the Revisers to insert in iii. 22 the italicised word '*back*' ('bring him *back* to me'), which completely destroys the meaning of the verse, and indeed is contrary to the whole reasoning of Ecclesiastes? Similarly, in iv. 8 the insertion of the italicised '*saith he*' only mars the force of the original. In iv. 13 the last clause of the Authorised Version is better than the Revised, and in verse 14 the second clause must be rendered: 'although [or even 'though] he was born poor in his kingdom' (i.e. that of the foolish old

We bespeak the patience of the reader for a few additional criticisms. In chapter v. verse 1 should be rendered: 'to draw nigh to hear is better than that [when] fools bring sacrifice'—this, with evident reference to verse 2. Again, verse 3 becomes only intelligible if we translate: 'For a dream cometh through a multitude of troubles [or businesses], and the speech of a fool [what he utters, his rash words and vows] through a multitude of words.' In verse 6 we would translate: 'Suffer not thy mouth to bring punishment upon thy flesh' [*not* 'to cause thy flesh to sin,' as the Revisers render it]; 'neither say thou before the messenger of God [the priest] that it was inconsiderateness (rashness),' not 'error,' as in the Authorised and Revised Versions. Nor is there any occasion for the tasteless italicised addition of the Revisers to verse 7. Without it we read, only transposing the word 'vanities' (as Delitzsch proposes): 'For in the multitude of dreams and in many words *there are* also vanities.'

We could not without much explanation restore sense to the revised rendering of Eccles. v. 8–10, nor yet to some expressions in chap. vi. But it might puzzle the 'wisest man' to understand what is meant in Eccles. vi. 10 by: 'Whatsoever hath been, the name thereof was given long ago, and it is known that it is man,' to which the margin gives an additional flavour of bewilderment by the not very novel information that 'the Hebrew' is 'Adam,' with an obliging reference to Gen. ii. 7. The verse, however, really means that all is predestined, so that there is no use of contending against it (v. 11): 'It is destined (in that sense of the word "known") what a man is,' as Delitzsch explains: his whole being is predestined. Not many will see the logical *nexus* in vii. 3: 'For by the sadness of the countenance the heart is made glad,' though all will perceive the sense in Nowack's rendering, 'For while the countenance is sad, the heart is [may be] glad.' In verse 12 the word 'advantage' should be substituted for 'excellency.' Few will be satisfied with the rendering of verses 18 and 24, any more than they will be able to understand their meaning in the new version. But, surely, the Revisers could scarcely have been serious with their italicised addition in Eccles. viii. 10: 'I saw the wicked buried, and they came to *the grave*.' Whither else should they have come, if they were buried? The

king). These are only a few illustrations of the general misunderstanding of the text.

right words to be substituted are not: '*to the grave*,' but '*to rest*' (comp. Is. lvii. 2). Strange and mysterious in its rendering is much of what follows, especially in the exposition of fatalism. But when we get beyond this, the meaning of ix. 17 is certainly not what the Revisers make it, but as follows: 'The words of the wise heard *spoken* in quietness 'are better than the cry of a ruler among fools.' We are reminded of the saying in x. 1: 'A little folly doth outweigh wisdom and honour,' when the Revisers repeat in verse 2 the rendering of the old version: 'A wise man's heart is at his right hand; but a fool's heart is at his left.' Would it not have been both wiser and more accurate to have rendered '*towards* his right hand,' indicating, according to well-known usage, the right direction of one's purposes and deeds?

But we must not continue what, for its proper understanding, would require a continuous Commentary rather than detached criticisms. When at the close of our task we take a retrospect, we are constrained to express both regret and disappointment. Regret—because, for the reasons previously stated, the work of the Revisers must be pronounced a failure, so far as concerns what was its primary object; and that, when real success was so near. The Revised Version of the Old Testament neither can nor should take the place of the Authorised. Disappointment—because, besides sins of commission and of omission, the revision shows so little independent original work, of which some of the Revisers, taken individually, would have been so eminently capable. The learned Revisers have done both too little and too much: too little for the scholar; too much for the general reader. The Hebraist who is acquainted with German Commentaries cannot learn anything from it, while he who is not a Hebraist may be easily and even seriously misled.

ART. VI.—*The Greville Memoirs (Second Part): being a Journal of the Reign of Queen Victoria from 1837 to 1852.* By the late CHARLES CAVENDISH F. GREVILLE, Esq., Clerk of the Council. Three volumes. 8vo. London: 1885.

THE appearance of these volumes will occasion a pleasant surprise. When the first part of Mr. Greville's Diary was published eleven years ago, an impression prevailed that a considerable period would elapse before the remainder of it was made public. The editor's language encouraged this belief. In deciding to 'commit to the press' that portion only of the Memoirs which embraced 'the reigns of King George IV. and King William IV.,' he drew a distinction between a narrative of the present reign and a diary written during the reigns of her Majesty's predecessors. An opinion was consequently formed that the remainder of the work would probably not be published during the lifetime of the existing generation. Mr. Reeve justifies in his preface the contrary decision at which he has now arrived by citing the precedents of previous publications of a similar character. Some of the most famous memoirs which have been given to the public have appeared while the events which they recorded were still green, and while many of the persons mentioned in their pages were still alive; and in our own time, which may be described as an age of memoir-writing, an even greater haste is frequently visible. During the last twelve months two autobiographies—one of a living poet, another of a living statesman—have been reviewed in our own pages; and Mr. Jennings has published the Croker memoirs, extending to a far more recent period than that to which the present volumes relate. While, during the last ten years, Sir Theodore Martin and Mr. Ashley, to take the most obvious examples, have both drawn the reigning sovereign into the arena of political controversy. It is difficult to determine how the appearance of any political diary can be condemned as premature by anyone who approves the publication of these works.

Mr. Reeve, however, does not rely on precedent alone. He rightly concludes that it is his duty to carry out the intentions of the trust which Mr. Greville confided to him. Mr. Greville, indeed, left to Mr. Reeve's decision the proper time for the publication of his diary; but he indicated his own opinion that the Memoirs should not 'be locked up' until they had lost their principal interest by the death of

‘all those who had taken any part in the events they describe.’ If Mr. Reeve desired to carry out his friend’s wishes, he had not much time to lose. The statesmen with whom Mr. Greville lived on terms of the closest intimacy have already passed away. We believe we are right in saying that no one who was a member of Lord Melbourne’s Cabinet in 1841 is still living; that only one member of the Cabinet which fell with Sir Robert Peel is alive; that only two members of Lord John Russell’s Cabinet and only three members of Lord Derby’s first Cabinet survive. For the rest, ‘a labore re-
‘quiescentes opera sequuntur.’ They rest from their labours, and the memoirs of some of them remain behind them.

Neither, however, the precedent of distinguished authors nor the mere lapse of time would alone afford adequate justification to Mr. Reeve. The propriety of publishing a book turns neither on precedent nor on time, but on the character of the book itself; and Mr. Reeve may with confidence appeal to the pages which he has edited as the best vindication for his decision. As Mr. Greville grew in years and experience his diary became more and more a political memoir. These volumes contain far fewer references to social topics than those which preceded them. They contain few—we had almost written no—allusions to any private individuals which can cause pain to their descendants. The characters of public men, indeed, which are drawn with exceptional skill and vigour, come occasionally under a different category, for Mr. Greville was a keen politician, and some of his judgements may seem harsh, while a few of them are perhaps unjust. But the characters of public men are the legitimate subjects of public criticism, and their children have no right to complain if their fathers are painted in different colours from those in which they would have presented them to us themselves.

There are, indeed, a few isolated passages in the work, dissecting the character of one prominent person, which will be read with feelings of regret, for they are the confessions of a man conscious of great powers and of having misused many opportunities. The person Mr. Greville speaks of with the greatest severity is himself. Whatever sorrow, however, may be felt at these passages, no one has a right to complain that he should have dealt more harshly with his own character than with that of any of his contemporaries. Yet we decline to accept, without qualification, the verdict which Mr. Greville pronounces on his own life. No doubt it is true that he gave much time

to the turf which he might have devoted to worthier objects, and that, even at the moment of his greatest successes—for instance, when ‘Mango’ won the St. Leger for him—he felt ‘dissatisfied and disquieted’ in his mind, and regretted that his life was spent ‘in the alternations of excitement ‘from the amusement . . . and of remorse and shame at ‘the pursuit.’ He would probably have been both a happier and a wiser man if he had resolutely withdrawn from the sport which distracted his attention from better things. Perhaps if he had from the first chosen another part, he might have helped to make history instead of merely recording it. But, when we see what Mr. Greville did, the influence which he exercised, and the good which on many occasions he accomplished by his conduct and interference, when we compare his life with the lives of the mass of mankind, we feel that his description of his own career is needlessly severe: ‘I have had all the facilities I could desire for ‘spending my time among the cultivated and the wise, or ‘among the dissipated, the foolish, and the ignorant; and ‘with shame and sorrow I must admit that by far the largest ‘proportion of my time has been wasted on and with the ‘latter.’ Almost every page of this Diary affords proof that this self-condemnation was not accurate or just.

In this review, however, we are rather occupied with Mr. Greville’s matter than with his character, and we accordingly pass on from his introspective passages to the political history which he so clearly relates. Each of these three volumes almost exactly coincides with the record of a single ministry. The first of them deals with the Melbourne Administration, from the Queen’s accession in 1837 to the fall of the Whigs. The second of them embraces the period of Sir R. Peel’s Government; the third of them is mainly devoted to the records of Lord J. Russell’s Ministry. Mr. Greville throws a flood of light on the history of England during the whole of this time. Just, indeed, as the former volumes of his Diary provide us with the best account of the inner political history of England during the reigns of the fourth George and the fourth William, so these present volumes furnish us with the most complete story of the three first administrations of the present reign which has ever yet been published.

It is indeed true that Mr. Greville’s account of Sir Robert Peel’s Administration is neither so precise nor so judicial as his story of the Melbourne and Russell Ministries. In the first place, he was not on such intimate terms with the members of Sir Robert Peel’s Cabinet as those on which he

stood with many of Lord Melbourne's colleagues. As he himself said, 'I am placed in very different circumstances with the present and the late Government. I have no intimacy or social habits with any of these people, and the consequence is that I know little or nothing of what is going on.' And, in the next place, it was much more difficult for a contemporary observer to appreciate the policy of Sir Robert Peel than to describe the proceedings of Lord Melbourne and Lord J. Russell. For the man who lived during the rule of Sir Robert Peel was always in danger of overlooking the policy of the Minister, and of concentrating his attention on the inconsistencies of the man. It requires the perspective of time to bring the chief events in Sir Robert Peel's career into due proportion, and to show that the changes of opinion for which that great Minister was reproached were due to the gradual and regular development of his ideas.

It is not, however, only the domestic policy of Sir Robert Peel to which Mr. Greville fails, as we think, to do full justice. We were a little disappointed to find that he has laid so little emphasis on Lord Aberdeen's foreign policy. His omission in this respect is the more to be regretted because his account of Lord Palmerston's rule at the Foreign Office is at once the fullest, the best, and, we must add, the most severe that has ever been composed. But no reader will ever fully understand the objections which were raised to Lord Palmerston's foreign policy who is not acquainted with Lord Aberdeen's administration of the Foreign Office; and unfortunately there is no portion of recent history with which even those who profess to instruct the public have so little familiarity. The ignorance which prevails on this subject is partly due to the same causes which explain Mr. Greville's comparative silence upon it. Lord Palmerston's foreign policy was much more obtrusive or attractive than Lord Aberdeen's. The policy of the one was essentially affirmative. He was always doing something which his admirers thought brilliant and his detractors pronounced to be rash. The policy of the other, on the contrary, was usually negative. His chief care was to assuage the passions which his energetic predecessor had excited, and to abstain from unnecessary intervention. Vigour, both in act and language, was customary in the one minister. Prudence, both in speech and policy, was the characteristic of the other.

It is time, however, to pass on from these preliminary observations to Mr. Greville's pages. The contrast which, at

the outset, they present between the old King who was just dead and the young Queen, who had just ascended the throne, will be read with pleasure. Mr. Greville, in a few sentences, has given us an excellent portrait of the good-natured, passionate, and undignified monarch 'who never received the homage of 'a bishop without giving him a lecture,' and whose custom 'of giving toasts and making speeches at all his dinners was 'more suitable to a tavern than a palace.' Very different is the picture he has left us of his successor. We have never read so pleasant a description of her character, her capacity, her conduct, as that with which Mr. Greville supplies us.

'Everything is new and delightful to her. She is surrounded with the most exciting and interesting enjoyments; her occupations, her pleasures, her business, her court, all present an unceasing round of gratifications. With all her prudence and discretion she has great animal spirits, and enters into the magnificent novelties of her position with the zest and curiosity of a child.' (Vol. i. p. 22.)

High Church, in the person of Dr. Hook, thought it necessary to address a lecture, in the shape of a sermon, to Her Majesty:—

'On her return to Buckingham House, Normanby, who had been at the chapel, said to her, "Did not your Majesty find it very hot?" She said, "Yes, and the sermon was very hot too."*

'The life which the Queen leads is this: she gets up soon after eight o'clock, breakfasts in her own room, and is employed the whole morning in transacting business; she reads all the despatches, and has every matter of interest and importance laid before her. At eleven or twelve Melbourne comes to her and stays an hour. . . . At two she rides with a large suite (and she likes to have it numerous); Melbourne always rides at her left hand. . . . After riding she amuses herself for the rest of the afternoon with music and singing, playing, romping with children, if there are any in the Castle (and she is so fond of them that she generally contrives to have some there), or in any other way she fancies. The hour of dinner is nominally half-past seven, but she seldom appears till eight. . . . Melbourne invariably sits on her left, no matter who may be there. . . . She orders and regulates every detail herself, she knows where everybody is lodged in the Castle, settles about the riding or driving, and enters into every particular with minute attention. But while she personally gives her orders to her various attendants, and does everything that is

* This, of course, was the famous sermon on 'Hear the Church!' We have somewhere heard a story of Archbishop Whately in reference to this sermon which is worth preserving. 'Hear the Church!' said the Archbishop; 'that is not a text, it is only part of a text. Why did he not give some more of it: "If he neglect to hear the Church, let him."'

civil to all the inmates of the Castle, she really has nothing to do with anybody but Melbourne, and with him she passes (if not in *tête à tête* yet in intimate communication) more hours than any two people, in any relation of life, perhaps ever do pass together besides. He is at her side for at least six hours every day—an hour in the morning, two on horseback, one at dinner, and two in the evening. . . . His manner to her is perfect, always respectful and never presuming upon the extraordinary distinction he enjoys; hers to him is simple and natural, indicative of the confidence she reposes in him, and of her lively taste for his society, but not marked by any unbecoming familiarity.' (Vol. 5. p. 146-148.)

The circumstance which won for Lord Melbourne the Queen's confidence is thus told:—

'Lady Cowper told me yesterday that the Queen said to Lord Melbourne the first thing which had convinced her he was worthy of his confidence was his conduct in the disputes at Kensington last year about her proposed allowance, in which, though he knew that the King's life was closing, he had taken his part. She considered this to be a proof of his honesty and determination to do what he thought right.' (Ibid. p. 81.)

And no man ever better deserved his sovereign's confidence.

'I have no doubt he is passionately fond of her, as he might be of his daughter if he had one, and the more because he is a man with a capacity for loving without having anything in the world to love. It is become his province to educate, instruct, and form the most interesting mind and character in the world. No occupation was ever more engrossing or involved greater responsibility. I have no doubt that . . . he discharges this great duty wisely, honourably, and conscientiously.' (Ibid. pp. 130, 131.)

During the first four years of the Queen's reign, Lord Melbourne remained on these terms of intimacy with Her Majesty. As Mr. Greville says elsewhere, he was 'all in all 'at Buckingham Palace.' But, while the Prime Minister enjoyed the confidence of the Crown to this extraordinary extent, he had little or no weight either in Downing Street or Parliament. In the House of Lords the majority, under the guidance of Lord Lyndhurst, thwarted or opposed the action of the Ministry. In the House of Commons parties were so equally divided that the Government depended for their majority on the support of the Irish members. Mr. Greville, indeed, gives, on the authority of the seventh Duke of Bedford, a different account of the famous Lichfield House contract from that which has usually been received. But he does not deny that the imperfect arrangement with O'Connell 'exposed the Government to as much obloquy as if

‘they had concluded an open and avowed alliance with him, and perhaps to greater inconvenience.’ Lady Holland put the situation of the Cabinet as concisely as possible. ‘She said, “The fact is, we have nothing to rely upon but the “Queen and Paddy.”’

The weakness of the Ministry as a whole, moreover, was increased by the weakness of its individual members. Mr. Greville wrote in 1838 :—

‘The front Treasury bench is in a deplorable state. John Russell is without support; Rice is held cheap, and is ineffective; Palmerston never utters except on his own business; Thomson and Hobhouse never on any business; and Howick alone ventures to mix in the fight.’ (Ibid. p. 55.)

‘In such low estimation are all Lord John’s colleagues, that not one of them is deemed capable of taking his place in the event of his giving it up.’ (Ibid. p. 61.)

On the first day of 1839 he noted :—

‘The Government is in a wretched state of weakness, utterly ignorant whether it can scramble through the Session, unable to assume a dignified attitude, to investigate with calm deliberation the moral and political condition of the country, and to act upon its convictions with firmness and resolution, tottering and staggering between one great party and one fierce faction, and just able to keep on its legs because both are, for different reasons, willing to wound but afraid to strike.’ (Ibid. p. 154.)

He added at the close of the Session :—

‘Those who watch the course of events and who occasionally peep behind the curtain have but a sorry spectacle to contemplate :—a Government miserably weak, dragging on a sickly existence, now endeavouring to curry a little favour with one party, now with another; so unused to stand, and so incapable of standing, on any great principles, that at last they have, or appear to have, none to stand on.’ (Ibid. p. 232.)

Things, indeed, a little improved during the following year. Lord John Russell, by his tact and conduct, succeeded in diverting attention from the weakness of the Cabinet.

‘At the end of the session, Sir Robert Inglis said to one of the Government people, “Well, you have managed to get through the session very successfully.” “Yes,” said the other, “thanks to your dissensions among yourselves.” “No,” said Sir Robert, “it is not that, but it is the conduct of your leader, his honesty, courage, and ability, which has enabled you to do so.” Ley, the clerk of the House of Commons, and a man of great experience, said he had never seen the business so well conducted as by John Russell.’ (Ibid. p. 293.)

But if Lord John Russell conciliated support by his con-

duct, he estranged a certain number of his supporters by his opinions.

‘There is a violent faction in the Cabinet and in the Government who are indignant with him for his finality speech last year, to which they ascribe the ruin of their cause.’ (Ibid. p. 180.)

Mr. Macaulay, indeed, on his return from India, said :—

‘The Radicals were extinct, being reduced, as far as he could learn, to Grote and his wife.’ (Ibid. p. 112.)

But there was at any rate Radicalism enough extant to disturb a Ministry which, Whig in origin, in name, and in theory, was declared by one of its members to be ‘as Conservative a Cabinet as possible.’

If the Melbourne Ministry be judged from its parliamentary status, it is difficult to find either justification or excuse for its prolonged existence. It degraded its party, it degraded its principles, it degraded the cause of Government itself, by remaining in office long after it had lost its power. But if the Government must from this standpoint be condemned, it must be recollected, on the other hand, that its chief, by training the young Queen’s mind, did a work such as no British minister had ever done before, and which entitles him to the warm appreciation of posterity. In criticising the conduct of the Melbourne Administration, we are consequently driven to dwell on the character of the Prime Minister, and Mr. Greville has furnished us with a portrait of Lord Melbourne which will make people who have derived their knowledge of that statesman from Mr. Torrens much better acquainted with him. ‘Admirable, indeed, as many of Mr. Greville’s portraits are—excellent, for instance, as are his characters of Lord Bessborough, of Mr. Charles Buller, and of others—we think that he has in no case formed a juster estimate of any person than that which he has given us of Lord Melbourne. It is too long to transfer to these pages as a whole, but we cannot refrain from giving the following extracts from it :—

‘It is a very difficult thing to write a good article upon Melbourne, and describe fairly and truly his political career. He lived surrounded by books, and nothing prevented him, even when Prime Minister, and with all the calls on his time to which he was compelled to attend, from reading every new publication of interest or merit, as well as frequently revelling amongst the favourite authors of his early studies. His memory was extremely retentive, and amply stored with choice passages of every imaginable variety, so that he could converse learnedly upon almost all subjects, and was never at a loss for copious illustra-

tions, amusing anecdotes, and happy quotations. This richness of talk was rendered more piquant by the quaintness and oddity of his manner, and an ease and naturalness proceeding in no small degree from habits of self-indulgence and freedom. He was often paradoxical, and often coarse, terse, epigrammatic, acute, droll, with fits of silence and abstraction, from which he would suddenly break out with a vehemence and vigour which amused those who were accustomed to him, and filled with indescribable astonishment those who were not. He never was really well fitted for political life, for he had a great deal too much candour, and was too fastidious to be a good party man. It may be said of him, at least in his earlier days, that he was

“For a patriot too cool, for a drudge disobedient,
And too fond of the right to pursue the expedient.”

And still less was he fit to be the leader of a party and the head of a Government, for he had neither the strong convictions, nor the eager ambition, nor the firmness and resolution which such a post requires. From education and turn of mind, and from the society in which he was bred and always lived, he was a Whig; but he was a very moderate one, abhorring all extremes, a thorough Conservative at heart, and consequently he was only half identified in opinion and sympathy with the party to which he belonged when in office; he often dreaded and distrusted his colleagues, and was secretly the enemy of the measures which his own Government originated, and of which he was obliged to take the credit or bear the obloquy. He hated the Reform Bill which he was obliged to advocate. But it was upon the accession of the Queen that his post suddenly grew into one of immense importance and interest, for he found himself placed in the most curious and delicate position which any statesman ever occupied. Victoria was transferred at once from the nursery to the throne—ignorant, inexperienced, and without one human being about her on whom she could rely for counsel and aid. She found in her Prime Minister a man of mature age, who instantly captivated her feelings and her fancy by his deferential solicitude and by a shrewd, sagacious, and entertaining conversation, which were equally new and delightful to her. She at once cast herself with implicit confidence upon Melbourne, and, from the first day of her reign, their relations assumed a peculiar character, and were marked by an intimacy which he never abused. His loyal devotion soon warmed into a parental affection, which she repaid by unbounded manifestations of confidence and regard. He set himself wisely, and with perfect disinterestedness, to form her mind and character, and to cure the defects and eradicate the prejudices from which the mistakes and faults of her education had not left her entirely free. He never scrupled to tell her what none other would have dared to say; and in the midst of that atmosphere of flattery and deceit which kings and queens are almost always destined to breathe, and by which their minds are so often perverted, he never scrupled to declare boldly and frankly his real opinions, strange as they sometimes sounded, and unpalatable as they often were, and to wage war with her prejudices and false impressions with regard to

people or things whenever he saw that she was led astray by them. He acted in all things an affectionate, conscientious, and patriotic part, endeavouring to make her happy as a woman, and popular as a queen. His influence and authority at Court were not diminished, nor his position there altered by her marriage; but the Prince, though always living on very friendly terms with him, was secretly rejoiced when the political power of this great favourite was brought to a close; for, so long as Melbourne was there, he undoubtedly played but an obscure and secondary part. When the inevitable change of Government at last took place, the parting between the Queen and her Minister was very sorrowful to both of them. The Queen often pressed him to accept the Garter, but he never would consent, and it was remarked that the Prime Minister of England was conspicuous at Court for being alone undecorated amidst the stars and ribands which glittered around him. At the time Melbourne left office he was only an occasional guest at Court, but the Queen continued to correspond with him constantly, and gave him frequent proofs that her regard for him was undiminished. He had been so completely absorbed by the Court, that for many years he had been almost lost to society; but as soon as he was out of office, he resumed his old habits, and was continually to be found at Holland House, at Lady Palmerston's, and with a few other intimate friends. There he loved to lounge and sprawl at his ease, pouring out a rough but original stream of talk, shrewd, playful, and instructive. A sensualist and a Sybarite, without much refinement or delicacy, a keen observer of the follies and vices of mankind, taking the world as he found it, and content to extract as much pleasure and diversion as he could from it, he at one time would edify and astonish his hearers with the most exalted sentiments, and at another would terrify and shock them by indications of the lowest morality and worldly feelings, and by thoughts and opinions fraught with the most cold-hearted mocking and sarcasm. His mind seems all his life long, and on almost every subject, to have been vigorous and stirring, but unsettled and unsatisfied. It certainly was so on the two great questions of religion and politics, and he had no profound convictions, no certain assurances about either. He studied divinity eagerly and constantly, and was no contemptible theologian; but he never succeeded in arriving at any fixed belief, or in anchoring himself on any system of religious faith. It was the same thing in politics. All the Liberal and Constitutional theories which he had ever entertained had been long ago more than realised, and he was filled with alarm at the prospect of their further extension. All his notions were aristocratic, and he had not a particle of sympathy for what was called progressive reform. He was a vehement supporter of the Corn Laws, abused Peel with all the rancour of a Protectionist, and died in the conviction that his measures will prove the ruin of the landed interest. During his administration his great object seemed to be to keep a rickety concern together, less from political ambition than from his personal feelings for the Queen. He abhorred disputes and quarrels of every description, and he was constantly temporising and patching them up when they occurred in his Cabinet (as they often did) by all sorts of expedients, seldom asserting

either the dignity or the authority of his position as head of the Government. Such weak and unworthy misrule brought his Cabinet, his party, and himself into contempt, and it was unquestionably in great measure owing to his want of judgement and firmness that they became so unpopular, and at last fell with so little credit and dignity as they did in 1841. Taking him altogether, he was a very remarkable man in his abilities and his acquirements, in his character and in his career, with virtues and vices, faults and merits, curiously intermingled, and producing as eccentric results as society has often beheld.' (Vol. iii. pp. 241-249.)

Such was the Prime Minister of England during the first four years of the present reign. But during the whole period another man, very different in character, in principles, and in conduct, was constantly winning, to an increasing extent, the confidence of the people. We do not think that Mr. Greville has given us so clear a portrait of Sir Robert Peel as that which he has drawn of Lord Melbourne. The unsocial qualities, which repelled so many of Sir Robert's followers, probably left their mark on Mr. Greville. The Queen in 1841 said that 'Peel was so shy it made her shy,' and on the very next page Mr. Greville records that Her Majesty after dinner 'talked for some time to Peel, who 'could not help putting himself into his accustomed attitude 'of a dancing-master giving a lesson. She would like him 'better if he would keep his legs still.' 'Confound the 'fellow!' he wrote two years before; 'what a cold feeler and 'cautious stepper he is!' But, though Mr. Greville probably disliked Sir Robert Peel, he bore ample testimony to what he calls his 'superiority.' He saw, as the majority of his fellow-countrymen saw, that the great leader of the Conservative party was the most competent of living statesmen; and he wished, as the majority of his fellow-countrymen wished, that the reins of administration should be entrusted to the fittest hands.

'Charles Buller owned to me that it was time such a miserable apology for a Government as the late Cabinet was (these were my words, not his) should come to an end: a government of departments, absolutely without a chief, hating, distrusting, despising one another, having no principles and no plans, living from hand to mouth, able to do nothing, and indifferent whether they did anything or not, proposing measures without the hope or expectation of carrying them, and clinging to their places for no other reason than because they had bound themselves to the Queen, who insisted on their continuance in spite of their feelings of conscious humiliation and admitted impotence, merely because she loved to have Melbourne domesticated at Windsor Castle, and she could not have him there on any other terms.' (Vol. ii. p. 49.)

The manner in which Lord Melbourne and Lord John Russell behaved to their opponents was infinitely to their credit. If they failed as ministers, they fell as gentlemen. The Duke of Bedford told Mr. Greville that Lord Melbourne had done everything he could to mitigate the bitter hostility between the Queen and the Tories—

‘so much so that when lately the Queen was inveighing against the Tories to somebody (he would not say to whom), and complaining of their behaviour to her, she added, “It is very odd, but I cannot get Lord Melbourne to see it in that light.”’ (Vol. i. p. 257.)

Lord John Russell behaved with equal fairness. After the dissolution of 1841 he

‘communicated the Queen’s Speech to Peel on Monday, in order that he might have time to frame his amendment. He behaved very well about this. He said that it was a very extraordinary occasion: that as the speech was one which invited an amendment, it was fair to give the other side an opportunity of framing it in the most advisable manner, his great object being that the Queen’s dignity and *position* should be consulted and cared for. Accordingly he proposed to the Cabinet that he should be authorised to send the Speech to Peel, to which they would not agree. On this he took it upon himself to do so, and he wrote to Fremantle, and told him if Peel would like to see the Speech he would send it him. Peel was very glad to have it, so Lord John sent it through Fremantle, and this gave them time to consider their amendment, and excellently done it is.’ (Vol. ii. p. 32.)

Nor did the courtesies end at this point. After the formation of Sir Robert Peel’s Administration Mr. Greville happened to meet Lord Melbourne at dinner at Stafford House.

‘After dinner he took me aside and said, “Have you any means of speaking to *these chaps*?” I said, “Yes, I can say anything to them.” “Well,” he said, “I think there are one or two things Peel ought to be told, and I wish you would tell him. Don’t let him suffer any appointment he is going to make to be talked about, and don’t let her hear it through anybody but himself; and whenever he does anything, or has anything to propose, let him explain to her clearly his reasons. The Queen is not conceited; she is aware that there are many things she cannot understand, and she likes to have them explained to her elementarily, not at length and in detail, but shortly and clearly; neither does she like long audiences, and I never stayed with her a long time. These things he should attend to, and they will make matters go on more smoothly.”’ (Ibid. p. 39.)

We live so rapidly at the present time that perhaps few of us remember the appalling condition of affairs both at home and abroad at the time when Sir Robert Peel thus

entered on his second administration. We shall have some observations to make on the aspect of our affairs abroad before we conclude this article. At home, a series of deficits had strained the credit of the nation, and had taxed the resources of Whig financiers. Extreme depression prevailed in commercial circles, and the labouring population, suffering from protracted distress, was preparing a remedy for its misfortunes by a resort to force. In 1842 both crime and pauperism attained the highest levels which they have ever reached in Great Britain.

These circumstances, indeed, were not so perceptible at the time as they are now. But Mr. Greville saw clearly enough the nature of the crisis.

‘The Ministers are all come to hold Cabinets, and lay their heads together with, God knows, plenty to occupy them. Lord Wharncliffe and Kay Shuttleworth, who are both come from the north, have given me an account of the state of the country and of the people which is perfectly appalling. There is an immense and continually increasing population, deep distress, and privation, no adequate demand for labour, no demand for anything, no confidence, but a universal alarm, disquietude, and discontent. Nobody can sell anything. Somebody said, speaking of some part of Yorkshire, “This is certainly the happiest country in the world, for *nobody wants anything*.” Kay says that nobody can conceive the state of demoralisation of the people, of the masses.’ (Vol. ii. p. 119.)

Such was the deplorable condition of the country when Sir Robert Peel took office, and such was the state of things which led him to propose his two famous budgets of 1842 and 1845. By reviving the income tax in the first of these years, and by continuing it in the second of them, he succeeded in terminating deficits. In 1842 he used the surplus which he thus created to repeal most of the export duties and to reduce the import duties enumerated in the Customs tariff. He carried the same policy a step further in 1845 by sweeping away the remaining export duties and many of the import duties retained for purposes of protection alone. It is curious to notice the enthusiasm which the first of these great measures aroused in an intelligent observer like Mr. Greville. Only a few days before he had plaintively declared that the generation of great men had passed away.

‘On Friday night in the midst of the most intense and general interest and curiosity, heightened by the closeness and fidelity with which the Government measures had been kept secret, Peel brought forward his financial plans in a speech of three hours and forty minutes, acknowledged by everybody to have been a masterpiece of financial statement. The success was complete; he took the House by storm; and

his opponents, though of course differing and objecting on particular points, did him ample justice. A few people expected an income tax, but the majority did not. Hitherto the Opposition have been talking very big about opposing all taxes, but they have quite altered their tone. It is remarkable to see the attitude Peel has taken in this Parliament, his complete mastery over both his friends and his foes. His own party, *volentes aut volentes*, have surrendered at discretion, and he has got them as well disciplined and as obedient as the crew of a man-of-war. This just measure, so lofty in conception, right in direction, and able in execution, places him at once on a pinnacle of power, and establishes his government on such a foundation as accident alone can shake. Political predictions are always rash, but certainly there is every probability of Peel's being minister for as many years as his health and vigour may endure. Only a few weeks ago I heard from my Whig friends of nothing but his weakness and embarrassments, and of all the difficulties his own supporters would cause him, what a poor figure he cut, &c.; but now they have not a word to say, and one of them who had been loudest in that strain, brought to the Travellers', where I was dining, an account of Peel's speech, and said, "One felt, all the time he was speaking, 'Thank God, Peel is "Minister!"' There can be no doubt that he is now a very great man." (Vol. ii. pp. 87, 88.)

But it is still more curious to notice how soon the enthusiasm wore off. The Conservatives, who composed the majority of the House of Commons, complained that their leader was carrying liberal measures. Sir Robert had neither the tact nor the temper which would have enabled him in social converse to remove the unfavourable impression, and thus the minister, notwithstanding his achievement, before a year was over, received only a reluctant and half-hearted support.

This result was partly due to two other circumstances. In the first place the Cabinet was deficient in debating power. Sir Robert himself declared in 1841 that he 'had not had a single application for office from anybody who was fit for it.' The Cabinet included, indeed, Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham; it enjoyed the assistance of Sir W. Follett as Law Officer, and it was joined soon after its formation by Mr. Gladstone. But Sir W. Follett died; Lord Stanley insisted on going to the House of Peers, where his services were much required;

'Ripon is done up; the Duke of Wellington is grown so much deafer lately that he can no longer lead the House; Wharcliffe does but moderately; the Chancellor does nothing at all; and Aberdeen confines himself to his own business.' (Vol. ii. p. 256.)

Mr. Gladstone left the ministry, and the whole weight of

the struggle was thrown on Sir Robert Peel and Sir James Graham. Thus, according to Mr. Greville,

‘no Government ever was weaker in point of speakers in the House of Commons, nor was there ever a Cabinet in my recollection so stuffed with mediocrity.’ (Ibid. p. 268.)

But, in the next place, it was not the inferiority of Sir Robert Peel’s colleagues, but the character of his measures, which accounted for his growing unpopularity. In all that Sir Robert Peel did he diminished the protection which previous legislation had given to agriculture. In 1842 he revised the Corn Law of 1828, he sanctioned, for the first time, the importation of foreign cattle, and he reduced the duties on foreign butter and cheese; in 1843 he passed a measure admitting Canadian corn at a low rate of duty; in 1844 he repealed the import duty on wool, and in 1845 he removed the duties on grease, lard, and hides. The student of Peel’s ministry will probably trace in these measures the gradual evolution of the minister’s ideas; but he will not be surprised at Sir Robert Peel’s followers seeing in them a settled purpose to carry measures opposed to the fundamental principles of the Tory party.

Thus, after four years of office, Sir Robert Peel had lost the popularity which he once enjoyed, and his administration was rather endured than supported by his followers. Mr. Greville wrote in August 1845:—

‘The session of Parliament has ended, leaving Peel quite as powerful, or more so, than he was at the beginning of it. Everybody says affairs are in a strange state, but nobody foresees, and few seem to desire, any change. The world seems weary of what are called politics, there is not a spark of party spirit visible. The Whigs see no prospect of coming into office, or making a Government that would be able to stand, and people will not make exertions and spend money, without a reasonable expectation of some tangible result. On the other hand, everything like enthusiasm for Peel is extinguished; the Tories hate, fear, but do not dare oppose him. If the Whigs cannot see any alternative, the Tories can see still less; and odious as Peel’s conduct is to them, and alarming as his principles are, they still think they are better off, and on the whole in less danger with him than with any other Ministry that could be formed. He has completely succeeded in getting the Court on his side, so that between the support he gets from one side on account of his liberality, and that which he continues to receive from the other on account of a combination of motives, habit, fear, hope, and patronage, he is in fact, though very unpopular, still very powerful. Everybody expects that he means to go on, and in the end to knock the Corn Laws on the head, and endow the Roman

Catholic Church; but nobody knows how or when he will do these things.' (Ibid. p. 290.)

In one sense, no doubt, Mr. Greville's shrewd anticipation was accurate. We have Sir Robert Peel's own authority for saying that his opinions on the justice and necessity of protection to British agriculture, originally adopted without much reflection, had been modified by experience. The minister could not avoid perceiving the force of Mr. Cobden's arguments, and he was conscious of his inability to answer them to his own satisfaction. But we are satisfied that, if the potato famine had not occurred, Sir Robert would have rested on the curious compromise which he had initiated in 1842. The measure of that year had, indeed, been denounced by some reformers as worthless, while it had been accepted by others as an instalment; but it was a compromise of the minister's own making, to which he had an especial interest in adhering. It was the potato famine, or the alarm which the potato famine produced, that led to the repeal of the Corn Laws.

It is now well known that, in the autumn of 1845, the Cabinet met to consider the measures which scarcity in Ireland demanded. A minority in the Ministry supported Sir Robert Peel's opinion that the crisis should be met by the suspension and ultimate repeal of the Corn Laws. Up to the last moment it was hoped that its other members, though they dissented from the proposal, would imitate the Duke of Wellington and waive their own opinions. Two men, however, the Duke of Buccleuch and Lord Stanley, declined to give way; and Sir Robert Peel, considering that it was impossible to persevere with his measure in a divided Cabinet, on December 5 went down to Osborne and placed his resignation in the Queen's hands.

In the meanwhile the public had been expecting with curiosity and alarm the occurrence of a crisis. Councils 'called without a cause, and dismissed without a consequence,' in Lord Beaconsfield's exaggerated and inaccurate language, 'agitated England, perplexed the sagacious Tories, and disturbed even the serene intelligence of the 'profound Metternich.' But, on December 4, the 'Times' for the moment terminated the prevailing curiosity by

'announcing, with an air of certainty and authority, that the discussions and disputes in the Cabinet had terminated by a resolution to call Parliament together early in January, and propose a total repeal of the Corn Laws, and that the Duke had not only consented, but was to bring forward the measure in the House of Lords.' (Vol. ii. p. 309.)

The 'Times' has rarely made a more inaccurate announcement; and, oddly enough, after the story had been formally contradicted by other newspapers, it still clung to its own statement. It is easy, however, to account for the error of the 'Times.' What is extraordinary is that writers who profess to narrate history should have accepted the 'Times' account as true, when the most cursory examination of dates would have shown them that it was incorrect. Even Miss Martineau declares that the 'Times' had true information, though she declines to reproduce the chit-chat of London as to the means by which the information had been obtained. But Mr. McCarthy is less scrupulous, and tells us that the blandishments of a gifted and beautiful lady had somehow extorted the secret from a young and handsome member of the Cabinet. We are sorry to destroy Mr. McCarthy's romantic fabric, but we can find no evidence of the gifted and beautiful lady, and the young and handsome member of the Cabinet (Mr. Sidney Herbert) had already passed his thirty-fifth birthday. It seems that Lord Aberdeen, who was in frequent communication with Mr. Delane, sent for him on December 3, 'and after talking to him about all 'sorts of matters connected with foreign policy, and many 'other things, began upon the Corn Laws, and told him, in 'fact, the substance of what appeared in the article.'

'When the article appeared yesterday morning, Lord Wharncliffe was in a great state of agitation, and told Reeve (as he had done before) that it was not true, that the "Times" was mystified, and had been all along. Reeve said that certainly the editor of the "Times" thought he had good authority for what he had put forth, and would not have risked his credit so far without strong grounds, but that if Lord Wharncliffe really meant to declare that to his knowledge the statement was false, he would, if he pleased, send for Delane and tell him so. He hung back on this, and said he did not wish to appear. Reeve said he need not appear, but if he would *authorise* the contradiction, it should be contradicted. He would not, however, but said that "nothing was settled." There can be very little doubt that it was Aberdeen's object that Delane should publish what he did, though he did not tell him to do so, and the reason is very obvious. Yesterday the American Mail went off, and it took with it the morning papers, and consequently this article in the "Times." It was exactly what Aberdeen wanted. As Foreign Secretary his most earnest desire is to get over the Oregon affair as well as he can, and he knows that nothing will have so great an effect in America, nothing tend so materially to the prevalence of pacific counsels, as an announcement that our Corn Laws are going to be repealed.' (Vol. ii. p. 312.)

For a week the mystery remained unsolved. People hardly

knew whether to believe the statements of the 'Times' or the contradictions of other newspapers. In point of fact on December 5 Sir Robert Peel, unable to obtain the support of a united Cabinet, had resigned; and at the end of the week it was seen that Lord John Russell was endeavouring to form a government. The causes which led to Lord John Russell's failure are well known. Sir Robert Peel returned to power, and, after carrying the great measure of repeal with which his name will always be associated, was defeated on an Irish Arms Bill and finally resigned office. He fell

'in the midst of such a storm of rage, abuse, and hatred, as no other minister was ever exposed to. His political opponents are not disposed to give him credit for either wisdom or patriotism, while his followers (friends he has none) heap reproaches upon him, in which they exhaust the whole vocabulary of abuse, and accuse him of every sort of baseness, falsehood, and treachery. And what is the cause of this mighty change? It is because he is wiser than his people, that he knows better than they do what are the true principles of national policy and national economy; because, amidst a chaos of conflicting prejudices and interests, amidst the clashing of mighty powers, he entertains sound views and wants to give effect to them.' (Vol. ii. p. 325.)

Mr. Greville states that Sir Robert Peel in parting from the Queen begged her

'never to ask him to take office again, that he could not help remembering that Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, and Mr. Canning had all died in office, and victims of office; that he did not dread death, and this recollection would not deter him; but when he recollected also that Lord Castlereagh and Lord Liverpool had also died in office, the one a maniac and the other an idiot, that recollection did appal him, and he trembled at the idea of encountering such a fate as theirs.' (Vol. iii. p. 55.)

It is useless now to speculate whether, if Sir Robert Peel had lived, he would have kept the resolution which he had formed of refusing office. His premature death in 1850 settled the question, and afforded Mr. Greville an opportunity of sketching his character. Though we do not think that the portrait which he has thus given us is so striking as the likeness which he has drawn of Lord Melbourne, we cannot resist the pleasure of making some extracts from it:—

'My acquaintance with Peel was slight and superficial. I never associated with him, and never was in his house except on two or three occasions at rare intervals. He scarcely lived at all in society; he was reserved but cordial in his manner, had few intimate friends, and it may be doubted whether there was any one person, except his wife, to whom he was in the habit of disclosing his thoughts, feelings, and intentions

with entire frankness and freedom. In his private relations he was not merely irreproachable, but good, kind, and amiable. The remarkable decorum of his life, the domestic harmony and happiness he enjoyed, and the simplicity of his habits and demeanour, contributed largely, without doubt, to the estimation in which he was held. He was easy of access, courteous and patient, and those who approached him generally left him gratified by his affability, and edified and astonished at the extensive and accurate knowledge, as well as the sound practical sense and judgement, which he displayed on all subjects. It was by the continual exhibition of these qualities that he gained such a mastery over the public mind, and such prodigious influence in the House of Commons. . . . In 1835 the rash and abortive attempt of William IV. to get rid of the Whigs made Peel the minister of a hundred days. This was the most brilliant period of his life, and it was during that magnificent campaign that he established the vast reputation which, while clouds of suspicion and distrust, of enmity and dislike, were all the while gathering about him, made him for nearly twenty years by far the most conspicuous, important, and powerful of English statesmen. He not only reorganised his party, but he revived its political influence, and laid the foundation for regaining its former power. His policy was as successful as it was wise. He flung himself cheerfully and confidently into the new order of things, associated himself with the sentiments and the wants of the nation, and day by day saw his reputation increasing both in Parliament and throughout the country. The Tories abandoned themselves to his guidance with a mixture of passive reliance and admiration and of lurking resentment for the past with distrust and suspicion for the future. They rejoiced in the chief who made them once more powerful, and led them on to victory; but they felt that there were no real sympathies between themselves and him. While he was boldly advancing with the spirit of the age, they were lagging behind, gloomily regarding his manifestation of Liberal principles, in which they did not participate, and lingering on those traditions of the past which they saw that he had entirely forsaken. . . . The misfortune of Peel all along was, that there was no real community of sentiment between him and his party, except in respect to certain great principles, which had ceased to be in jeopardy, and which therefore required no united efforts to defend them. There was no longer any danger of organic reforms; the House of Lords and the Church were not threatened; the great purposes for which Peel had rallied the Conservative interest had been accomplished; almost from the first moment of his advent to power in 1841 he and his party stood in a false position towards each other. He was the liberal chief of a party in which the old anti-liberal spirit was still rife. . . . They considered Peel to be not only the minister, but the creature, of the Conservative party, bound above all things to support and protect their especial interests according to their own views and opinions. He considered himself the minister of the nation, whose mission it was to redress the balance which mistaken maxims or partial legislation had deranged, and to combine the interest of all classes in one homogeneous system, by which the prosperity and happiness of the whole commonwealth would be

promoted. They thought of nothing but the present sacrifices which this system would entail on the proprietors of land, while he thought only of the great benefits which it would ultimately confer upon the people at large.' (Vol. iii. pp. 349-357.)

We cannot devote the same space to the domestic policy of Lord John Russell's administration which we have given to that of Sir Robert Peel. In reviewing Sir Robert Peel's Ministry, indeed, we are conscious that we are dealing with the history of great measures. In reading the history of Lord John Russell's administration, we are too frequently reminded that we are busy with the history of little manœuvres. In the one case we are chiefly concerned with great principles, in the other with small expedients. This circumstance is no doubt partly due to the different characters of the two men. Sir Robert Peel was a strategist, Lord John Russell a tactician. But it was also, to some extent, occasioned by the circumstances in which each minister was placed. Sir Robert Peel was borne to power by a large majority, while Lord John Russell presided over a House of Commons split into sections.

In fact, from the fall of Sir Robert Peel to the formation of Lord Aberdeen's Administration, public men in England were grouped into three parties. The old Whigs ranged themselves under Lord John Russell; the new Protectionists submitted to the guidance of the late Lord Derby; while the followers of Sir Robert Peel stood aloof from both parties, rendering on the whole, however, support to the Government. Lord John Russell, in fact, could neither have formed a ministry in 1846 nor have maintained himself afterwards in power if he had not received the unselfish assistance of his great rival. It was the misfortune, however, of Lord John Russell that, while his ministry was dependent on Sir Robert Peel, he personally disliked and distrusted that statesman; and this dislike and distrust was shared by the Whigs. As Mr. Greville puts it:—

'The most remarkable circumstance is the intense interest and curiosity which are felt about Peel's opinions and intentions. Everybody asks with anxiety what he says, what he thinks, what he will do. His vanity may well be gratified by the immense importance which is attached to his opinions and to the course he may take and recommend; his power seems to be as great out of office as it ever was in office; nothing was ever so strange or anomalous as his position. He is liked by nobody. The Conservatives detest him with unquenched hatred, and abuse him with unmitigated virulence. The Whigs regard him with a mixture of fear, suspicion, and dislike, but treat him with great deference and respect.' (Vol. iii. p. 100.)

Yet, though the Whigs distrusted Sir Robert Peel, Sir Robert himself gave them a generous support, and, with his assistance, everything prospered.

‘The Government here are going on very well. Lord John speaks excellently; the Speaker says he never saw any Government do their business so well. Charles Wood’s success is an immense thing for them; a good Chancellor of the Exchequer is a tower of strength to a Government. Goulburn was only Peel’s chief clerk; Wood is taking a flight of his own. Every day strengthens the Government by exhibiting the utter incapacity of the Opposition, and the impossibility of any other Government being formed.’ (Vol. iii. p. 69.)

But, though the Session of 1847 opened favourably, the aspect of affairs soon changed. Mr. Greville wrote on July 13, 1847:—

‘The session is drawing to a close, but far from satisfactorily for the Government, who have lost ground in public estimation. Bill after bill has been thrown over, and, after a great deal of time entirely wasted, the session will end with hardly anything having been done.’ (Ibid. p. 95.)

And still more strongly in the beginning of 1848:—

‘There can be no doubt that, as a Government, their position is very unenviable; they are not strong in numbers—that is, they have not an absolute majority of the House of Commons—and they are in a minority in the House of Lords. They enjoy no confidence and no favour; neither collectively nor individually are they strong in public confidence and attachment. There is no enmity to them, and they have a sort of negative support, as being well-intentioned, honest, tolerably capable, and, from the state of parties, the only possible Government.’ (Ibid. pp. 128, 129.)

Sir James Graham told him in the following June that ‘matters were going on worse and worse; the Government seemed to be paralysed and to have lost their under-standing.’

Yet this Government, which clever bystanders thought paralysed, had undoubtedly elements in its composition which commanded the confidence of reasonable men. The administration of the Home Office by Sir George Grey was firm and wise; Ireland, first under Lord Bessborough and afterwards under Lord Clarendon, was admirably governed; and the Prime Minister himself was dexterous in debate and capable in administration. The Ministry, moreover, had another source of strength which rarely failed them in an emergency. Men might distrust their principles or differ from their policy, but they would have supported almost any measures to keep them in office. For if the Whigs fell, the

government of the country could only be entrusted either to the Peelites or the Protectionists; and the Peelites consisted of generals without an army, and the Protectionists comprised an army without generals.

Of Sir Robert Peel's position we have already spoken. We have no doubt that he was sincere in his desire to refrain from accepting office. We are not surprised to learn from Mr. Greville that Lord Stanley expressed a similar reluctance:—

'Stanley must now be ready to tear his hair at having quitted the House of Commons, for with all his great power of speaking (never greater than now) he is lost in the House of Lords, where it is all beating the air. Then in the House of Commons he must trust to George Bentinck and Disraeli: the former with an intemperance and indiscretion ever pregnant with dangerous dilemmas; and the other with a capacity so great that he cannot be cast aside, and a character so disreputable that he cannot be trusted.' (Vol. iii. p. 51.)

Lord Stanley, however, was ever eager for the fray and reckless of the consequences. On Friday night—so Mr. Greville wrote in February 1847—

'there was a fight and a division, in which the Government beat Stanley by eight. He probably did not make great exertions, but, on the other hand, not one of the Peelite peers, members of the late Government, voted with him. The whole affair was characteristic of Stanley, and, as such, is worth recording. He had resolved to attack the Sugar measure of the Government by proposing to refer it to a committee, and he sent for his peers to come up and support him. Clarendon asked him if he really intended to do this, and suggested he had better inform himself of the merits of the question before he decided. He agreed, and they sent Wood, the Chairman of the Excise, to him, who was with him for two hours, explained everything, and satisfied him the measure was unobjectionable. After this Clarendon asked him again if he still meant to bring on his motion. "Oh yes," he said, "I mean to give you a gallop. It is a long time since you have had one, and it will do you good. Besides, I have brought my people up, and I must give them something to do now they are come." If he had got a majority he would have been more perplexed than the Government, and this is the man the peers are ready to follow and to make Prime Minister.' (Ibid. p. 59.)

It is worth while to add one other extract to illustrate his singular character. After the ministerial crisis of 1851, Mr. Greville met him at Newmarket:—

'It was worth while to be there to see Stanley. A few weeks ago he was on the point of being Prime Minister, which only depended on himself. Then he stood up in the House of Lords, and delivered an oration full of gravity and dignity, such as became the man who had

just undertaken to form an Administration. A few days ago he was feasted in Merchant Taylors' Hall, amidst a vast assembly of lords and commoners, who all acknowledged him as their chief. He was complimented, amidst thunders of applause, upon his great and statesmanlike qualities, and he again delivered an oration, serious as befitted the lofty capacity in which he there appeared. If any of his vociferous disciples and admirers could have suddenly found themselves in the betting room at Newmarket on Tuesday evening and seen Stanley there, I think they would have been in a pretty state of astonishment. There he was in the midst of a crowd of blacklegs, betting men, and loose characters of every description, in uproarious spirits, chaffing, rowing, and shouting with laughter and joking. His amusement was to lay Lord Glasgow a wager that he did not sneeze in a given time, for which purpose he took pinch after pinch of snuff, while Stanley jeered him and quizzed him with such noise that he drew the whole mob around him to partake of the coarse merriment he excited.'

A character of this kind is not unattractive. The many-sided man is sure to gain admirers and win friends. But something more than merriment and fun is required in a Prime Minister; and Lord Stanley's deficiencies created distrust among statesmen. Thus the Russell Ministry, throughout its existence, owed more to the weakness and the divisions of its adversaries than to its own strength; and its fall was ultimately precipitated, not by any combination of its opponents, but by its own disruption.

This fact will be clear enough if the circumstances under which the Ministry resumed office in 1851, and retired from office in 1852, are considered. In the first of those years a casual defeat in a thin House induced Lord John Russell to submit his resignation to the Queen, and Her Majesty sent for Lord Stanley. According to Lord Malmesbury, the timidity of Mr. Herries and Mr. Henley prevented Lord Stanley from forming a Government. We have some hesitation in dissenting, on such a point as this, from Lord Malmesbury's account, though we believe that the recollection of all the survivors of Lord Derby's first Cabinet does not accord with it.* But the fact is, that we know enough of the history

* Mr. Greville says of Lord Stanley's failure on this occasion:— 'It was not without some appearance of sarcasm and bitterness that Stanley spoke of the men of his own party, who for various reasons had declined to take office. The man whose private affairs prevented him was Tom Baring; the modest man was Henley, who is said to have told Stanley that he would not *disgrace* his Government by presenting himself to the House of Commons as Home Secretary; the man who thought it would not last is said to be Thesiger. Sugden accepted the Great Seal, and the Duke of Northumberland the

of the crisis to be quite sure that the scruples and fears of two individuals had nothing to do with Lord Stanley's failure. He was unable to take office, not from the weakness of his own followers, but from his inability to obtain help from outside. The distinguished body of statesmen who had been associated with Sir Robert Peel still held aloof from both parties in the State, and Lord Stanley thought—and thought rightly—that without their aid the Protectionists were not in a position to hold their own against the Whig party. This state of things was, however, entirely altered in 1852. The abrupt dismissal of Lord Palmerston from the Foreign Office had made the strongest man in the Whig Cabinet an opponent of the Whig Ministry. Under these circumstances the Protectionists no longer hesitated to accept the reins of office, and if Lord Palmerston had not again rejoined his old friends, they might possibly have formed an enduring administration.

Thus, at the close of 1851 or at the commencement of 1852, Lord Palmerston became the central figure in English politics, and the position which he thenceforward occupied was wholly different from that which he had previously filled. During the first quarter of this century Lord Palmerston was known to the general public as a man of fashion, to his colleagues as a man of diligence. During the second quarter of this century Lord Palmerston won the admiration of large masses of his fellow-countrymen, and became the terror of foreign nations, by a vigorous and, on the whole, successful foreign policy. During the third quarter of the century Lord Palmerston succeeded in almost convincing his contemporaries that, while he lived, he was the only possible Prime Minister.

In these volumes, however, we are only concerned with Lord Palmerston's career at the Foreign Office. No other work with which we are acquainted gives so full and accurate an account of his administration. The few people who have made it their business to study Lord Palmerston in his speeches and despatches will possibly find their previous convictions and suspicions strengthened and confirmed by Mr. Greville. The larger public, whose acquaintance with Lord Palmerston is derived from Lord Dalling, Mr. Evelyn Ashley, and Sir Theodore Martin, will probably form a new

Admiralty, for which nobody imagines that he has any qualification whatever; and it shows what slender materials Derby could command when he applied to such a man.' (Vol. iii. p. 387.)

idea of Lord Palmerston's rule. They may continue to approve the policy which he adopted, or the vigour with which he enforced it; they will be hardly prepared to defend his conduct either to his colleagues or to his sovereign.

Anyone, however, who wishes to understand Lord Palmerston's administration of foreign affairs, must recollect the alteration effected in the Minister's position by the resignation of Charles, Earl Grey, and the accession of Lord Melbourne to power. Lord Grey, throughout his administration, was Prime Minister in the fullest sense of the term. His personal character was impressed on every department of the Government. Lord Melbourne, on the contrary, was the chairman rather than the presiding genius of the Cabinet. He was much more anxious that the machine should work smoothly than that it should travel in the direction in which he would have preferred to go; and, though he wished his colleagues to move under his orders, he liked neither the trouble nor the discomfort of enforcing his commands. The Cabinet over which he presided, like that over which Lord Liverpool had presided years before, became a Government of departments; and each minister acted in his own sphere, in his own way. And this was especially the case with the Foreign Office. Lord Palmerston had the strongest will in the Government, and he became the brother-in-law of the Prime Minister by his marriage with Lady Cowper. His capacity and character made him restless of control: his close connexion with Lord Melbourne increased the difficulty of controlling him.

The first difficulty arose in connexion with the late Mr. Urquhart.

'The history of Urquhart is this. William IV. was nearly mad upon the subject of Russia, and Sir Herbert Taylor either partook of his opinions or ministered to his prejudices. Urquhart, who had been in the East, published a violent anti-Russian pamphlet, which made some noise, and which recommended him to the notice of Taylor, and through him to that of the King. His Majesty took up Urquhart and recommended him to Palmerston. Palmerston was not sorry to have an opportunity of gratifying the King, with whom the Ministers were never on cordial terms, and probably he was not disinclined to act, (so far as he dared) upon Urquhart's views. Accordingly he appointed him—a very extraordinary appointment it was thought at the time—Secretary of Embassy at Constantinople. There can be no doubt that Urquhart considered himself appointed to that station on account of the opinions he professed, and for the express purpose of giving them effect. He was very likely told so by the King, and left to infer as much by Palmerston. . . . At the same time Palmerston took care not to commit

himself in writing. When the death of the King was approaching Palmerston foresaw that he would have to change his tone with regard to Eastern politics, and consequently that it would be convenient to throw over Urquhart, which he proceeded to do. The man, first his tool and then his victim, turned out to be bold, unprincipled, and clever, and, finding his prospects ruined and his reputation damaged, he turned fiercely upon him whom he considered as his persecutor and betrayer.' (Vol. i. p. 119.)

But the Urquhart incident was gradually forgotten. Ibrahim Pasha's invasion of Asiatic Turkey drew attention to a more immediate danger to the Porte than the advance of Russia; and Lord Palmerston entered into the famous Quadruple Alliance for the purpose of compelling the Pasha of Egypt to relinquish Syria.

The history of this treaty is thus told by Mr. Greville:—

'The beginning of the business may be traced to a Cabinet held at Windsor last autumn, when the general line of policy was settled. From that time, however, the rest of the Ministers seem never to have interfered, or taken any interest in the matter, and Palmerston conducted it all just as he thought fit. This year, Cabinet after Cabinet passed over, and no mention was made of the affairs of the East, till one day, at the end of a Cabinet, Palmerston, in the most easy *nonchalant* way imaginable, said that he thought it right to mention that he had for a long time been engaged in negotiation upon the principles agreed upon at the Cabinet at Windsor, and that he had drawn up a treaty, with which it was fit the Cabinet should be acquainted. At this sudden announcement his colleagues looked very serious, but nobody said a word, except Lord Holland, who said that he could be no party to any measure which might be likely to occasion a breach between this country and France. No discussion, however, took place at that time, and it was agreed that the further consideration of the matter should be postponed till the next Cabinet. The following day Palmerston wrote a letter to Melbourne, in which he said that he saw some hesitation and disapprobation in the Cabinet at the course which he had recommended for adoption, and, as he could only hope to succeed by obtaining unanimous support, he thought it better at once to place his office at Melbourne's disposal. Melbourne wrote an answer begging he would not think of resigning . . . and then sent the correspondence to Clarendon. Clarendon immediately wrote word that he felt under such obligations to Palmerston that it was painful to him to oppose him; but as he could not support him in his Eastern policy, it was much better that *he* should resign, and begged Melbourne would accept *his* resignation. Melbourne, however, said, "For God's sake let there be no resignations "at all;" that his and Lord Holland's retirement would have the effect of breaking up the Government; and then it was suggested that they might guard themselves by a minute of Cabinet from any participation in the measure they objected to.' (Vol. i. p. 308.)

The treaty had the effect which Lord Holland had antici-

pated. It produced deep irritation in France. Lord Palmerston, however,

'talks in the most offhand way of the clamour that broke out at Paris, of his entire conviction that the French Cabinet have no thoughts of going to war, and that, if they were to do so, their fleets would be instantly swept from the sea, and their armies everywhere defeated. . . . Everything may possibly turn out according to his expectations. He is a man blessed with extraordinary good fortune; and his motto seems to be that of Danton, "*De l'audace, encore de l'audace et toujours de l'audace.*" But there is a flippancy in his tone, an undoubting self-sufficiency, and a levity in discussing interests of such tremendous magnitude, which satisfies me that he is a very dangerous man to be entrusted with the management of our foreign relations.' (Ibid. p. 299.)

The majority of the Cabinet had however assented to the policy of the treaty; the minority had acquiesced in it; and Lord Palmerston had thus far been successful. It was one thing, however, to assent to the treaty itself, it was another to agree to the measures to be taken under it. Lord Palmerston, on his part, was not inclined to half measures, and the country was represented at Constantinople by Lord Ponsonby, a diplomatist whom Lord Melbourne himself described as 'a danger greatly to be feared,' and who, with or without orders, was determined to effect Mehemet Ali's deposition. With Lord Palmerston at the Foreign Office, and Lord Ponsonby at Constantinople, the course of events flowed rapidly; and other members of the Cabinet, besides Lord Holland and Lord Clarendon, felt alarm at the crisis. Lord John Russell himself in September remonstrated with Lord Melbourne, and persuaded the Prime Minister to summon a Cabinet. Mr. Greville gives a striking picture, which he probably derived from Lord Clarendon, of the scene which then occurred. Lord John Russell urged that fresh advances should be made to France. Lord Palmerston complained that a minister, like Lord John, who had assented to the treaty, had no right to object to the proceedings which were the logical results of it; but he eventually consented to call the representatives of the four powers together and ask them to make some conciliatory overture to France. Lord Palmerston's colleagues were delighted with the concession which they had apparently obtained from the Foreign Minister. Yet he had in reality conceded nothing.

'He was perfectly aware that Brunnow and the Emperor of Russia would not concur in the proposal, or would at least delay it so long that it would be useless. Moreover,' he 'confidently relied, and

in this it turned out he was right, on the success of his naval measures against the Pasha, and on the Pasha's inability to resist them.' (Vol. i. p. 327, note.)

The result proved Lord Palmerston's acuteness. On the following day M. Guizot called on Mr. Greville

'in a great state of excitement, said it was useless our attempting to manage matters in the sense of peace here while Ponsonby was driving them to extremities at Constantinople, and causing the treaty to be executed *à outrance*. He then produced his own budget of intelligence, being the bombardment of Beyrout, the landing of 12,000 Turks, and the deposition of Mehemet Ali, and appointment of Izzar Pasha to succeed him.' (Vol. i. p. 328.)

Armed with these news, Mr. Greville himself went to Lord John Russell and Lord Holland. 'Lord John admitted that 'it was all very bad, but seemed to think that he could do 'nothing more, and that nothing was left but to wait and 'to preach patience.' From Lord Holland he 'learned that 'Metternich had expressed his strong disapprobation of the 'violent steps that' had been taken. But, though both Lord John Russell and Lord Holland disapproved these proceedings, neither of them had the courage to withstand their colleagues. As Mr. Greville put it—

'It is now quite clear that Palmerston has completely gained his point. The peace party in the Cabinet are silenced, and their efforts paralysed. In fact, Palmerston has triumphed and Lord John succumbed. The Cabinet are again dispersed, Palmerston reigns without let or hindrance at the Foreign Office.' (Vol. i. p. 330.)

But Lord John Russell had not finally succumbed. Another dispute almost immediately afterwards distracted the divided Cabinet.

'The occasion for this vigorous outbreak . . . was a proposal (transmitted by Beauvale) for a Congress for the settlement of all disputes, together with the draft of a short answer which Palmerston had written and sent, declining the offer. Lord John considered . . . that such an important suggestion should be received and rejected without any communication of it to the other members of the Government, especially to him, who was their leader in the House of Commons, was so outrageous that he was resolved not to pass it over; and he accordingly wrote his opinion upon it to Melbourne in the strongest terms, recommending him to transfer the lead of the House of Commons to Palmerston, and to dispose of his office as he pleased, as he would no longer go on. . . . Lord John ultimately determined to propose the recall of Ponsonby as the *sine quâ non* of his continuance in office.' (Vol. i. p. 344.)

Facts, however, again played into Lord Palmerston's

hands. News of fresh successes arrived from Syria. Lord Palmerston begged that a damper might not be cast on the enterprise. The fall of Acre soon afterwards decided the campaign and left the Foreign Minister triumphant.

‘Belonging to a Government, almost every member of which dislikes or distrusts him, he has acquired by recent events a great reputation, and is looked upon generally as a bold, able, and successful statesman.’ (Vol. i. p. 364.)

We have dwelt with some detail on these circumstances for two reasons. In the first place the internal dissensions of the Melbourne Cabinet are very imperfectly understood; and, in the next place, it is impossible to judge of the sufficiency of the causes which prevented Lord John Russell forming an Administration in 1845, without appreciating the differences which distracted the Whig Cabinet in 1840. It is well known that, in 1845, Lord John Russell failed to form a Government because Lord Grey objected to Lord Palmerston’s return to the Foreign Office; and Lord Palmerston insisted on being restored to that department. But we imagine that Mr. Greville’s readers will learn with surprise how general was the feeling of which Lord Grey was the exponent. At the Foreign Office itself, though full ‘justice was done to his ability and indefatigable industry, nothing could exceed the detestation with which’ Lord Palmerston was regarded. Lord Ashburton declared that if he ‘had continued for a year or two more at the Foreign Office, nothing could have prevented a war between us and France, for that he intrigued against France in every part of the world, and with a tenacity of purpose that was like insanity.’ Lord Melbourne admitted that he had inspired aversion ‘not only in France, but in all Germany, and said that his notion had been that everything was to be done by violence; that by never giving way or making any concession, and an obstinate insistence, every point was sure to be gained.’

Mr. Reeve, writing in 1845 to Mr. Greville from Paris, said:—

‘The apprehension with which the possibility of Lord Palmerston’s return to office was at first viewed prevails in its fullest extent at the Bourse and in the country. Rothschild says: “Lord Palmerston est un ami de la maison. Il dîne chez nous à Francfort. Mais il a l’inconvénient de faire baisser les fonds de toute l’Europe sans nous en avertir.”’

‘The King’s repugnance to Lord Palmerston is insurmountable.

He has spoken of him within the last few days as "l'ennemi de ma maison." (Vol. ii. p. 345, note.)

The Queen herself shared the general alarm, and made the sensible suggestion that Lord Palmerston should take the Colonial Office.

A difficulty of this character ought probably to have been got over. Lord John Russell, if he had been a stronger man, would have taken a distinct part in the dispute, and have sacrificed either Lord Grey to Lord Palmerston, or Lord Palmerston to Lord Grey. The late Sir Denis le Marchant, indeed, considered that the leader's reluctance to take office would do something to 'wipe out the recollection of those 'two years when we stayed in too long.' But Mr. Macaulay gave a conclusive answer to this plausible suggestion. 'I don't know that at all,' he said; 'it may only increase the blame. We stayed in when we ought to have gone out, and now we stay out when we ought to go in.'

Few things illustrate more accurately the versatility of Lord Palmerston's genius and the charm of his manner than the circumstance that the objections to his appointment in December 1845 had almost completely disappeared in June 1846. An opportune visit to Paris disarmed his opponents.

'His visit has been triumphantly successful. The Court, the Ministers, the Opposition, the political leaders of all shades, have vied with each other in civilities and attentions. He has dined with the King, with Guizot, with Thiers, with Broglie, with Molé; he met with nothing but smiles, *prévenance* and *empressement*.' (Ibid. p. 385.)

Under such circumstances it was impossible to raise further objection to his return to the Foreign Office; and the impediment, therefore, which had previously prevented the formation of a Whig Ministry, was effectually removed.

But the new Government was hardly settled in its seat before the old difficulty returned. The French complained that Lord Palmerston was wantonly disturbing the harmony which Lord Aberdeen had restored. His colleagues complained that he was acting without their knowledge; the Queen complained that she was neither consulted nor informed by her Foreign Minister. Nothing in Mr. Greville's diary comes out more clearly than the substantial grounds which unfortunately existed for all these complaints.

We do not propose to enter at any great length into the unfortunate episode of the Spanish marriages. We admit at once that Louis-Philippe and M. Guizot displayed a deplorable want of faith, of wisdom, and of temper. But no

one can read the French side of the dispute without perceiving that both King and Minister really did believe that Lord Palmerston was disturbing the implied arrangement which had been concluded between them and Lord Aberdeen. The gist of this arrangement was that the Queen of Spain should marry a Spanish Bourbon prince, and that, *when she had issue of the marriage*, her sister should be united to the Duc de Montpensier. But the French had distinctly said from the first that they would not be bound by the understanding, if at any time the Queen of Spain's marriage with a Coburg prince seemed imminent. Lord Palmerston, however, had not been a month in office before, in his famous despatch of July 19, he enumerated the Duke of Coburg among the possible candidates for the Queen's hand,* and Louis Philippe, believing this to be a breach of faith, hurried on the two marriages simultaneously. It was the fashion at the time to say that the mere mention of the Coburg candidate implied nothing, but it is an obvious answer, that, if nothing was intended, the Duke of Coburg should not have been named. If no departure from the agreement was intended, said Madame de Lieven, 'pourquoi 'nommer le Cobourg?' It was in vain that Mr. Greville told her

'for the fiftieth time that it never had entered into the head of Palmerston or of anybody else that *the mention of his name* would have raised such a notion or suspicion in them or in anybody, and that it was wonderful they would not see that if he had had the intention and that this letter contained the expression of it, the last thing he would have done would have been to show it to them.' (Vol. iii. p. 43.)

She could only return to her eternal question, 'Why, then, 'did you name him?' Those who have compared Lord Palmerston's private letters with his public despatches will, we fear, have no difficulty in deciding that there was more ground for Madame de Lieven's suspicions than for Mr. Greville's denial; that the mention of the Duke of Coburg

* Mr. Greville tells a curious story about this despatch. Lord John Russell, he writes, 'after acknowledging it was very injudicious, said: "I remember the despatch was brought to me on a Sunday morning, "just as I was going to church. I read it over in a hurry; it did not "strike me at the moment that there was anything objectionable in it, "and I sent it back. If I had not gone to church, and had paid more "attention to it, it would not have gone;" and upon this despatch, "thus carelessly read and permitted to go, hinged the quarrels with "France and with Spain, the Montpensier marriage, and not impossibly, "though indirectly, the French Revolution itself' (vol. iii. p. 299).

was no mere statement of a fact, but that the Duke was prominently named as one of the only two candidates from whom Lord Palmerston was willing that the Queen of Spain's choice should be made.

We do not desire, however, to dwell on the old story of the Spanish marriages. We are more anxious to pass on to Mr. Greville's surprising account of Lord Palmerston's relations both with his colleagues and the Queen. The public already know a good deal on this subject from Sir Theodore Martin's charges and Mr. Evelyn Ashley's apology. But the narrative of Lord Palmerston's conduct has never been related with such fulness and detail as in these volumes. Never probably before or since has any minister displayed equal indifference to the opinions of his colleagues; and the reader who rises from Mr. Greville's pages, instead of wondering at Lord Palmerston's dismissal in 1851, will feel surprise that he was not removed in 1847.

In 1847 Lord Normanby was ambassador in Paris; he was on the worst terms with M. Guizot, Louis-Philippe's minister, and in close communication with M. Thiers, M. Guizot's chief opponent. Such a state of things necessarily led to difficulty. Mr. Greville very sensibly concluded that Lord Normanby had better leave Paris for a time. Lord Palmerston, on the contrary, thought the occasion a proper one for delivering an ultimatum. He formally announced to the French ambassador in London that '*unless Normanby received an immediate and satisfactory reparation the intercourse between the two countries should cease.*' This, the gravest step that a Foreign Minister can take, was taken 'by Palmerston without any concert with, and without the knowledge of, his colleagues; and though John Russell, *the Prime Minister*, dined with him the same day, he did not think proper to impart to him what he had done.' Fortunately, however, Lord Clarendon received private intimation of what had occurred, and, resolving to act without loss of time, saw Lord John Russell.

'He opened on the subject of the state of the French quarrel and its possible consequences, and said, "What would you say if Palmerston was to make a communication to St. Aulaire that unless reparation was offered to Normanby, all intercourse between France and England should cease?" "Oh no," said John, "he won't do that. I don't think there is any danger of such a thing." "But he has done it," said Clarendon; "the communication has been made, and the only question is whether St. Aulaire has or has not forwarded it to the French Government." This at once roused Lord John, and he in-

stantly wrote to St. Aulaire requesting him, if he had not sent this communication to his Government, to suspend doing so. Fortunately it was not gone. What passed between Lord John and Palmerston I do not know, but the result has been a more moderate instruction to Normanby from both of them.' (Vol. iii. p. 62.)

In this instance Lord John Russell prevailed; about the same time Lord Palmerston used much more unscrupulous means to secure his object.

'During the Spanish discussions Beauvale was at Windsor, and one day when the Prince was in his room the draft of a despatch from Palmerston arrived to Lord John Russell, which he wanted to show to the Prince, and afterwards to submit to the Queen for her sanction. Finding the Prince was in Beauvale's room, he came there and read out the despatch. There was a paragraph in it saying the succession of the Duchesse de Montpensier's children would be inadmissible by the constitutional law of Spain (or words to this effect). Lord John said he thought this ought to be expunged; that we might say what we pleased as to the effect of treaties, but it did not become *us* to lay down the constitutional law of Spain; the Prince and Beauvale both concurred, and Lord John said he would strike out this passage, and submit it so amended to the Queen. He did so, and Her Majesty took the same view. It was returned so altered to Palmerston; but when the despatch was published, it was found that Palmerston had re-inserted the paragraph, and so it stood. What more may have passed I know not, but it is clear that they all *stood* it, as they always will.' (Vol. iii. p. 121.)

Grave as this incident was, however, it was soon succeeded by a much more serious action. It is well known that in 1848 Lord Dalling, who was then Mr. Bulwer and British Minister in Spain, was abruptly dismissed from Madrid in consequence of a despatch which he had received from Lord Palmerston and which he had communicated to the Spanish Government. What is not known is that this despatch was written in opposition to the distinct desire of the Prime Minister. Mr. Greville relates on the authority of the Duke of Bedford—

'that Palmerston had shown John Russell the despatch, and that Lord John had objected to it, stating his reasons for so doing. According to his custom, Palmerston made no reply; but they parted, Lord John naturally concluding that after he had stated his objection the despatch would not be sent. Shortly after he was with the Queen, and in conversation on this subject he told her what had passed between Palmerston and himself, and what he had said. "No; did you say all that?" said the Queen. He said, "Yes." "Well then," she replied, "it produced no effect, for the despatch is gone. Lord Palmerston sent it to me; I know it is gone." What more passed I do not know.

The only difference Palmerston made was that he divided his despatch to Bulwer into two, but he did not omit or alter a word of what Lord John had objected to.' (Vol. iii. p. 169.)

Mr. Greville adds naturally enough that, when he first heard this, he thought that such a daring defiance of the Prime Minister must lead to a quarrel, and that Lord Palmerston would be forced to resign. But he soon learned that, whatever else might happen, there was no chance of Lord Palmerston's resignation. The ministers, instead of pushing the quarrel to an extreme, undertook their colleague's defence. Lord Lansdowne, indeed, told Lord John Russell—

'this must never happen again, and it was arranged between them (he little knows how vainly) that for the future Lord John at least should see Palmerston's despatches before they go. Hobhouse spoke to me about it, and in reply to my remarks saying how unfair it was to place such a man as Lord Lansdowne in such a position, he very comically said, "I wish *you* would say all this to Palmerston." This was too good a joke, as I told him, that he a Cabinet Minister, his colleague and sharing his responsibility, could not tell him his mind, and should ask me to tell Palmerston the truths it behoved him to know. Both Labouchere and Charles Wood also spoke to me about it. I said to the latter, "*Unless Palmerston is quite incorrigible*, all this will be a lesson to him, and restrain him for the future." He replied, "You are quite right to put in that proviso." Such is the state of things in this Cabinet.' (Vol. iii. p. 174.)

Lord Lansdowne's stipulation was soon forgotten. A few weeks afterwards, in May 1848, Mr. Greville

'learnt that there had been a fresh matter of complaint against Palmerston, which had given Lord John great annoyance. It seems that several days ago Brunnow communicated to Palmerston that the Emperor of Russia had determined to make common cause with the King of Denmark, and at the same time he made this known to the Prince of Prussia. The next day the Prince went to pay a visit to the Queen, when he alluded to this important communication; the Queen was excessively embarrassed, for she had never heard a word about it, Palmerston having omitted to tell her. As soon as the Prince was gone, she sent for Lord John Russell, who was at Richmond. He came up to town and went to the Queen, who told him what had passed, describing her embarrassment, but said that she thought it better not to let the Prince know she was in ignorance of such a matter, and she had therefore pretended to be aware of it. By mere accident John Russell himself had received a box from Palmerston with this communication a few minutes before he went to the Queen; if it had arrived ten minutes later, he would have known nothing about it either. This coming after the Spanish affair, and so soon, does not improve Palmerston's position with the Queen or his colleagues.' (Vol. iii. p. 178.)

Things, when they are at their worst, occasionally tend to improve. The general indignation which Lord Palmerston's conduct had provoked among his colleagues afforded some prospect that he would be compelled to abstain from similar proceedings in future. Lord Grey told Lord John Russell plainly that matters could not go on longer as they had done; and Lord John admitted that 'something must be settled for the future.' But, in making the admission, he simultaneously revealed a new proceeding in which the Foreign Minister had been engaged not only without authority, but in opposition to his leader. It seems that Lord Palmerston had shown the Duc de Broglie a despatch on what Mr. Greville calls the Monte Video business, which the Duc de Broglie thought unpleasant.

'Immediately after, Palmerston joined the Queen in Scotland, leaving the conduct of this affair in the hands of John Russell. Lord John and the Duc de Broglie came to an understanding, but in the meanwhile Palmerston wrote a despatch to Normanby on the subject, which passed through London without being communicated to Lord John Russell. This, which Normanby was instructed to read to Guizot, surprised him very much, and he told Normanby that it was different from what the Duc de Broglie had given him reason to expect. This annoyed Normanby very much, and as it placed him in a very awkward situation, he complained of it. The matter was then explained, and eventually Guizot acted with so much moderation that it was adjusted amicably. Palmerston when urged on the subject threw the blame on the Foreign Office, which they say he is constantly in the habit of doing.' (Vol. iii. p. 185.)

It is plain, then, that throughout 1847 and 1848 Lord Palmerston on several occasions acted without consulting his colleagues, and, in some instances, in opposition to their opinions. But, in the beginning of 1849, his conduct led to serious inconvenience.

'Within the last few days fresh difficulties have arisen with reference to Lord Palmerston's conduct of foreign affairs, for he keeps the Queen, his colleagues, his friends, and the party in continual hot water; and on this occasion he seems to have given serious offence to a foreign Power, insomuch that a formal apology is said to be required of him.' (Vol. iii. p. 261.)

Mr. Greville imagined that Austria was the power by whom an apology was required, and his inference was justified by a statement of the late Lord Halifax 'that he did not think we had *done* anything we could not justify and defend, but unfortunately Palmerston's manner of doing things and the language he employed had given great offence, and

‘that it was much to be regretted that he had given advice ‘and expressed opinions in so offensive a tone as he had ‘done, especially to Austria.’ But it is probable that Mr. Reeve is right in saying that the power by whom an apology was required was not Austria but Naples. Lord Palmerston, in 1849, had connived at a supply of arms being furnished to the Sicilian insurgents. By a mere accident the editor of the ‘Times’ had become acquainted with the story, and had charged the Government with the circumstance.

‘No notice was taken of this first charge. It was therefore repeated in stronger language. Upon this, Lord John Russell (who knew nothing of the matter) took it up, said he must enquire into it, and that the charge must be contradicted or the practice stopped. On enquiry he found it was all perfectly true, and then it was that he compelled Lord Palmerston, sorely against his will, to make a formal official apology to the King of Naples, the man whom he most hated and despised in the whole world.’ (Vol. iii. p. 272 note.)

It seems almost incredible that, after these occurrences, the Ministry should have remained in office, and that Lord Palmerston should have remained a member of the Ministry. His colleagues, however, though they disliked his conduct, continued to acquiesce in it; and even Lord John Russell, who had laid down rules for Lord Palmerston’s guidance, never took the trouble to see them enforced.

There was, however, one person in the country who was not prepared to submit with equal tameness to the Foreign Minister’s proceedings. The Queen had seen with anxiety and alarm the course which Lord Palmerston was pursuing. She had remonstrated again and again, and her remonstrances had received little or no attention. She had even carried her complaints to the ‘more sympathetic ears of her ‘late minister,’ but she had failed to effect anything; and so matters remained, ‘the Queen abhorring her minister and ‘unable to rid herself of him; John Russell fascinated and ‘subjugated by the ascendancy of Palmerston, submitting to ‘everything from him and supporting him right or wrong.’ In 1850, however, a more serious case arose. Lord Palmerston took up the claims which Don Pacifico and other British subjects had made on the Greek Government; and his ‘bullying and paltry operations’ excited, in Mr. Greville’s language, ‘universal disgust.’ Ministers themselves were ‘conscious what a disgraceful figure they cut,’ and were ashamed of it.

‘The affair was not a measure well considered, discussed, and

agreed on by the Cabinet, but done in the true Palmerstonian style, offhand, partly and casually communicated to his colleagues, but so managed as to be his own act, to which they indeed became parties, completely implicated, but in which they were not really consulted, and which passed under their eyes without entering into their serious thoughts. Now that the whole magnitude of the scrape is revealed to them, they are full of resentment and mortification.' (Vol. iii. p. 311.)

The Queen invited Lord Clarendon to the Palace, and the moment he came into the drawing-room after dinner she

'exploded, and went with the utmost vehemence and bitterness into the whole of Palmerston's conduct, all the effects produced all over the world, and all her own feelings and sentiments about it. He could only listen and profess his own almost entire ignorance of the details. After she had done Prince Albert began, but not finding time and opportunity to say all he wished, he asked him to call on him the next day. He went and had a conversation of two hours and a half, in the course of which he went into every detail, and poured forth without stint or reserve all the pent-up indignation, resentment, and bitterness with which the Queen and himself have been boiling for a long time past. What he enlarged upon with the strongest feeling was the humiliating position in which the Queen was placed in the eyes of the whole world. The consciousness that all the world knew that she utterly disapproved of all that was done in her name, but that she was powerless to prevent it, was inconceivably mortifying and degrading. Prince Albert said he knew well enough the constitutional position of the Sovereign of this country; but that the nation disapproved of Palmerston's proceedings, and so did his own colleagues, Lord Lansdowne particularly; yet by their weak connivance he was allowed to set at defiance the Sovereign, the Government, and public opinion, while the Queen could get neither redress nor support from John Russell, and was forced to submit to such degradation.' (Vol. iii. p. 317.)

Lord Clarendon carried the Queen's complaints to Lord John Russell, who, as usual, took the matter 'in very good part,' and also, as usual, did nothing. But the Queen was not willing that nothing should be done. In May she saw her Prime Minister, and urged Lord Palmerston's removal from office.

'This time she found Lord John better disposed than heretofore, and he is certainly revolving in his mind how the thing can be done. He does not by any means contemplate going out himself, or breaking up the Government. What he looks to is this, that the Queen should take the initiative, and urge Palmerston's removal from the Foreign Office. She is quite ready to do this as soon as she is assured of her wishes being attended to.' (Vol. iii. p. 335.)

But again Lord Palmerston's dexterity and courage carried him through the dilemma. The debate on Mr. Roebuck's

motion gave him the support of the House of Commons, and the great speech which he delivered on the occasion made him the hero of the hour. The affair, 'which was to 'have shaken him from his seat, only made him more 'powerful than he was before;' and for the rest of the session Her Majesty forbore from renewing her complaints and from pressing for Lord Palmerston's removal.

But, though the Queen forbore from pressing her complaints—

'an attempt was made, with the concurrence of Lord John Russell, the Duke of Bedford, Lord Lansdowne, and Lord Clarendon, to induce him to take some other office in the Government, which, of course, he declined to do. The details of this negotiation cannot now be published, but they were the premonitory symptoms of the storm which wrested the Foreign Office from the hands of Lord Palmerston in the following year.' (Vol. iii. p. 362, note.)

And, as soon as the session was practically over, the Queen addressed to Lord John Russell the famous memorandum, in which, 'to prevent any mistakes for the future,' she thought it right to explain what she expected from the Foreign Secretary.

For more than a year after this memorandum was written, Lord Palmerston succeeded in conducting the foreign relations of the country without exciting the Queen's displeasure. In the autumn of 1851, however, M. Kossuth's visit to England became the occasion of another serious incident. According to Mr. Greville—

'While Kossuth was still at Southampton, I received a letter from my brother Henry, informing me that he had just received information that Palmerston was going to receive Kossuth, and he entreated me, if I had any influence with the Government, to try and prevent such an outrage, and that he believed if it was done Buol would be recalled. Thinking that it would be an outrage, and one in all probability attended with serious consequences, I resolved to write to John Russell at once. I sent him a copy of my brother's letter, only putting the names in blank, said that the authority on which this was notified to me compelled me to attend to it, and added, "I send you this without "comment; you will deal with it as you think fit. 'Liberavi animam "meam."' The result of this communication was that Lord John Russell addressed a remonstrance to Lord Palmerston. Lord Palmerston replied with his usual audacity that "he would not be dictated "to and should receive whomsoever he pleased in his own house, but "that his office was at the disposal of the Government." On receiving this answer Lord John instantly summoned a Cabinet and laid it before them. Ministers were of opinion (all but one) that Lord Palmerston should not receive Kossuth, and he accordingly submitted to the decision of his colleagues. (Vol. iii. p. 413.)

But, though Lord Palmerston nominally submitted to the decision of the Cabinet, he, as usual, seized the first opportunity of disregarding his colleagues' wishes. A deputation from Finsbury and Islington waited on him at the Foreign Office with an address 'in which the Emperors of Russia and 'Austria' were 'called despots, tyrants, and odious assassins,' and Lord Palmerston expressed great gratification at this demonstration. Mr. Greville wrote:—

'I think this is on the whole the worst thing he has ever done. The public do not know how bad it is, because they do not know what had previously passed in the Cabinet, and its consequences. The ostentatious bidding for Radical favour and the flattery of the democracy, of which his speeches were full, are disgusting in themselves and full of danger. It is evident that he has seized the opportunity of the Kossuth demonstrations to associate himself with them, and convert the popular excitement into political capital for himself. He thinks to make himself too formidable, by having the masses at his back, for his colleagues to dare to quarrel with him, and by this audacious defiance of them he intends to make himself once for all master of the situation. If they endure this tamely, he will be their master, and henceforward they must do his bidding, be it what it may.' (Vol. iii. pp. 415, 416.)

But Lord John Russell's patience was at last exhausted. In the following month he availed himself of a new indiscretion, which Lord Palmerston had committed in approving Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état*, to remove him from his office.

'But though this was the pretext, the *causa causans* was without any doubt the Islington speech and deputations, and his whole conduct in that affair. The Queen had deeply resented it, and had had a discussion with Lord John about it, for he rather defended Palmerston, and accepted his excuses and denials. It is evident that he did this, because he did not dare to quarrel with him on grounds which would have enabled him to cast himself on the Radicals, to appeal to all the Kossuthian sympathies of the country, and to represent himself as the victim of our disgraceful subserviency to Austria. But having thus passed over what would have been a sufficient cause of quarrel, he at once seized upon one much less sufficient, but which was not liable to the same difficulties and objections. In fully approving Louis Napoleon's *coup d'état*, Palmerston has taken a part against the feelings of the Radicals, and if the cause of the quarrel is made public, their approval will *ad hoc* be rather with John Russell than with him.' (Ibid. pp. 427, 428.)

We have made these extracts with some pain. It is, to say the least, doubtful how far it is right or desirable to criticise the conduct of the reigning monarch, and it is impossible to insert these passages without criticism; for there is no ques-

tion that, in the whole of the negotiations affecting Lord Palmerston, the Queen took a direct and personal part which is inconsistent with the restraints which she has, in almost every other matter, placed on her own action. But we feel that Mr. Reeve is fully justified in publishing these portions of Mr. Greville's diary, and that we are equally at liberty to comment on them. For her Majesty has herself shown a desire to court publicity, and, by placing materials at Sir Theodore Martin's disposal, has practically brought the whole controversy before her people; indeed, the same transactions are related with considerable minuteness in that work.

Neither the extracts which we have given, nor the fuller account which will be found in the pages from which we have taken them, will materially affect the judgement of historians on the parts which either Queen or Foreign Minister played in the matter. Mr. Greville, indeed, by giving details of complaints to which Sir Theodore Martin has referred in more general terms, has shown that the provocation which ultimately led to Lord Palmerston's removal was greater than most people had imagined. It is indeed difficult either to account for or to explain Lord Palmerston's conduct. From the resignation of Lord Grey in 1834 to his own removal in 1851, he showed an impatience of control which is inconsistent with his long previous career, which has never been tolerated in any other minister, and which brought him into continual collision with his colleagues and his sovereign. No doubt a growing consciousness of his own power encouraged him to act alone on occasions where both duty and courtesy required that he should act in conjunction with his colleagues; and thus the very circumstance which made him afterwards a successful Prime Minister rendered him 'impossible' as a colleague. But the opinion which he may have formed of his own power or his colleagues' incapacity cannot justify or excuse his conduct to the Queen. The ordinary rules of office, and, we are compelled to add, the common instincts of a gentleman, should have prevented him from treating the Queen as he habitually treated her. The scrupulous care with which her Majesty throughout her reign has subordinated her own opinion to that of her constitutional advisers, ought to make her Ministers equally scrupulous in explaining to her the policy to which they ask her to assent, and in adhering to the arrangements which she has approved.

It is the privilege of constitutional monarchs, and it should

be the business of constitutional statesmen, to shield the Crown from political controversy; and it was a grave error of judgement that the rules laid down for the Foreign Secretary's guidance should have emanated from the Sovereign and not from the Prime Minister. We are quite aware that, in subsequently reading a portion of the Queen's memorandum in the House of Commons, Lord John Russell admitted that he was the organ through which it was sent, and 'thus became 'responsible for the sanction of the document.' But our contention is that the document should have emanated from him and not from the Queen; and that he should neither have cast on the Queen, nor even allowed her to undertake, a duty which was essentially his own.

This, however, brings us to the concluding observations which we have to make on these Memoirs. They bring out clearly both the defects and the qualifications of Lord John Russell. Mr. Greville wrote with perfect truth in 1837:—

'He is a marvellous little man, always equal to the occasion, afraid of nobody, fixed in his principles, clear in his ideas, collected in his manner, and bold and straightforward in his disposition. He invariably speaks well when a good speech is required from him.' (Vol. i. p. 34.)

He wrote with equal truth in 1849:—

'John Russell is so infirm of purpose that he will not predominate over his Cabinet and prevent the chaos of opinions and interests.' (Vol. iii. p. 286.)

It was this infirmity of purpose which prevented his exercising an effective control over the stubborn will of his self-confident Foreign Minister, and which eventually almost forced the Queen to take the action which the Prime Minister ought to have taken.

In the remarks which we have thus made, we have purposely confined our observations to those passages of Mr. Greville's diary which throw most light on the inner political history of the period which it embraces. We have no space to extract from it any of the anecdotes which Mr. Greville tells so well, or any of the word-portraits which he so excelled in producing. We have, we hope, written enough to show that the second portion of these memoirs rivals the first in interest, and to induce our readers to turn from this review to the book which is its subject.

ART. VII.—*Types of Ethical Theory.* By JAMES MARTINEAU, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Manchester New College. Two volumes. 8vo. London and Oxford (Clarendon Press): 1885.

DR. MARTINEAU'S volumes are a noble monument of ripened genius, interesting both in themselves and in the circumstances of their publication. In his preface, which no reader should omit, the author tells us how he began his philosophical career as a pupil, and then as a teacher, of the prevalent empiricism of his youth. His mind was dominated by 'the maxims and postulates of physical knowledge,' 'shut up in the habit of interpreting human phenomena 'by the analogies of external nature.' 'He served successive 'terms of willing captivity to Locke and Hartley, to Collins, 'Edwards, and Priestley, to Bentham and James Mill;' and while restive under the ungenial dogmatism of the last two of those philosophers, he was refreshed and strengthened in his Necessarian modes of thought by literary and personal intercourse with the younger Mill. He felt, and at first willingly owned, the 'Spirit of the age' as embodied in this ardent apostle of the doctrine of Circumstance.

The period of Dr. Martineau's philosophical apprenticeship carries us back half a century, to a time just before the death of James Mill (1836), and when his son was rising to the height of his philosophical celebrity. As it was easy to swim with the current of the time, so it was comparatively difficult to turn against it and gain a higher footing. There were those indeed who had not been carried away by the prevalent tendency. Coleridge had opened a higher way some years before; and there was a group, among whom Maurice and John Sterling were conspicuous, who worked in the faith of Coleridge, and earnestly debated with the Necessarian School the true line of thought. But young Martineau does not seem to have had any connexion with this group. He engaged in a solitary struggle with the philosophy of his time, and gradually worked himself into clearer light in the course of his own labours as a teacher and thinker. It fell to his lot to have the grounds of his philosophical faith continually interrogated by his students; and under this discipline, in concurrence with his own 'deepening experience of the inward contents of human life,' his early impressions began to give way. The more he scrutinised the assumptions of physical science which he had accepted as axioms, the less could he rest in them 'as ultimate and valid for all thought.'

'Above all,' he says, 'I had to concede to the self-conscious mind itself, both as knowing and as willing, an autonomous function distinct from each and all the phenomena known and changes willed—a self-identity as unlike as possible to any growing aggregate of miscellaneous and dissimilar experiences. Visiting me at first as mere suspicions, these ideas insensibly loosened the set attitude of my convictions before I became distinctly conscious of a gradual veering in the direction of my thought.'

It was creditable, as many other facts of the like kind are, to the openmindedness of John Stuart Mill, that he did not withdraw his countenance from the companion thinker who was so evidently pushing forward in a different direction from himself:—

'A syllabus of my lectures,' says Dr. Martineau, 'having fallen into Mr. J. S. Mill's hands (early in 1841), he noticed the change, and with his keen intellectual glance measured its extent better than I had done myself; for old attachment and admiration still lingered with me and led me to minimise my breach with the past. Though he saw to the bottom of my apostasy, he did not cast me off as a lost scul. On the contrary, his manifestation of friendly interest in my future work at the old problem in new lines was generous and respectful; in expressing his desire to see its results he exhorted me against long delay of their publication: on these "great subjects," he said, "I do not want to have to wait for your lectures, which, like Brown's, will no doubt have to be published some day: but before that time I may *very likely be studying them in another state of existence*" (May 12, 1841). This unexpected turn of thought it is which has chiefly saved the memory of the correspondence. From a flexible compliant man of the world accustomed to be "all things to all men," it would have had little significance, but coming from one who was scrupulously precise in word, absolutely sincere in profession, and tempted by no play of humour to employ graces of accommodation, it seemed to me an interesting trait.'

We have quoted the passage for the same reason that Dr. Martineau preserved Mr. Mill's letter. It gives an interesting glimpse of both thinkers. They were virtually of the same age, but obviously, of the two, Mill's splendid precocities gave him the position of leader. John S. Mill was born in 1806; Dr. Martineau, we understand, in 1807.

It was the ethical idea, 'the irresistible pleading of the 'moral consciousness,' which, more than any other, made our author rebel against the limits of the merely scientific conception:—

'It became incredible to me,' he says, 'that nothing was possible except the actual; and the naturalistic uniformity could no longer escape some breach in its closed barrier to make room for the ethical alternative.'

The secret misgiving which I had always felt at either discarding or perverting the terms which constitute the vocabulary of character—"responsibility," "guilt," "merit," "duty"—came to a head, and insisted upon speaking out and being heard.'

In this way he was led to surrender determinism, to recall the true notion of cause hitherto banished from his thought and degraded to the rank of an antecedent, and, contrary to Comte's vaunted law of progress, he was driven back from physics to metaphysics.

Dr. Martineau's philosophical conversion was completed by a fifteen months' course of study in Germany (1848-9) under the guidance of Professor Trendelenburg. By the help of this great Aristotelian he was enabled to read a new and larger meaning into Plato and Aristotle, which again lifted a veil from the pages of Kant and Hegel. The result was a gradual widening of apprehension. The sphere of thought, not merely on the ethical side, but on all sides, opened up. 'The metaphysic of the world' came home to him, and the universe was revealed as not merely a collection of phenomena 'with no categories but the like and the 'unlike, the synchronous and successive,' but as the sphere of 'the possible' with its categories of the right, the beautiful, the necessarily true. His consciousness became penetrated by the distinction of the actual and the possible or ideal—the one answering to the world of objective science, the other to that of self-reflection. This distinction appeared to him not only valid in itself, but to clear the way for the legitimate adjustment of physics, in all its branches, and ethics—'apprehension of facts in their laws being the business of the one, the appreciation of springs of action, in 'their ranks, that of the other.' It will afterwards be seen how deeply this distinction enters into the whole method and argument of Dr. Martineau's thought.

This preliminary narrative has not only an interest in itself, but in its bearing on the value of the philosophical doctrine contained in these volumes. It is always something to have gained one's opinions after a struggle, and especially a struggle against odds and the pressure of old and traditional opinions. It is often set forth as the great merit of new views, that they have forced themselves upon the mind in the face of ancient and venerable dogmatism. But here is the case of a mind forced by deepening thought and experience from the new—or what was, in his youth, the new—back to the old. Bred, like Coleridge, a Hartleyan, he came also like him, but apparently without any contact

with his school, to the conclusion that the Experience philosophy was utterly inadequate, that it failed at once to satisfy the facts of life and the necessities of thought. He was driven back on metaphysic by sheer force of thinking, piercing more deeply to the base of experience, and gathering to itself a wider range of contents. This of course does not prove the truth of his later conclusions, but at any rate it gives them a definite significance and worth.

The author of these volumes has throughout pursued his philosophical career with a singular independence. He has worked uncountenanced by any coterie of thinkers, academic or otherwise. He carries no sectarian standard either of church or school, and if his thought is Christian it is not because he has been bred a Christian minister, but because he has worked out for himself the Christian as beyond doubt also the philosophical ideal. It is necessary to say so much as this, because, broad and open-minded and freely inquiring as Dr. Martineau's mind is, he has strangely suffered as a sectarian in philosophy as well as theology. When the chair of logic in University College, London, became vacant in 1866, no one had such claims to it as he had. He stood easily first among the candidates for the chair. But there were those of the negative school who, unlike its highest and best teacher, could not forgive his apostasy from the 'true faith' of Empiricism; and among them none more conspicuous than Mr. Grote, who headed a vehement and successful opposition to his candidature. This is an episode in Mr. Grote's life which even his warmest admirers would fain forget. It was creditable neither to his knowledge nor to his liberality. Even if he had felt himself bound to oppose a theistic candidate for a chair of philosophy, he was not called upon to use such strange words of ignorant contempt as he allowed himself to use. But the event had little effect on the ardour of Dr. Martineau's philosophical labours; and his reward has been abundant. The university world in England and Scotland is now alike eager to recognise him. Edinburgh called him to her tercentenary festival a year ago, and honoured him with her highest degree. Oxford has been proud to publish his volumes at the Clarendon Press; and critics from different sides have hastened to examine them as the most elaborate contribution in our time to the cause of spiritual philosophy. How far they may serve to turn the tide of opinion which has so long drifted in an opposite direction is another question. But none can doubt the brilliant earnestness and power with

which the author has performed his task, and least of all the effective polemic which he has brought to bear on the ethical sophistries of the time, and the argumentative ingenuities with which they have been defended. In the present paper we can only draw attention to some salient points and allow Dr. Martineau as far as possible to speak for himself. His style is at once so laden with meaning and so rich and subtle in its turns of expression—so profound and yet so poetic—that we gladly avail ourselves of it where we can.

An obvious criticism, however, occurs at the outset, which is indeed anticipated by the author himself. The book before us is 'neither a history nor a system of philosophical opinion, but a little'—we should say a good deal—'of both.' Its chapters succeed one another without order of time, and yet, in the first volume at least, are so richly inlaid with historic and biographic material as to seem chapters in the history of philosophy rather than argumentative disquisitions. They present, therefore, a wonderful *mélange* of earnest dialectic, interesting biography, and grave and lively exposition. This may seem to detract from the scientific character of the book; there is always a class of minds who have difficulty in reconciling felicities of style with a severely systematic handling of a subject; but we are certainly not of the number of those who object to this mixture of treatment. The biographic element so largely interspersed in the first volume is extremely interesting. In the case of Spinoza especially, of whom Dr. Martineau for the second time has made a special study and again in the case of Comte, the history of the men is essential to the full apprehension of their systems of thought. It is now so well recognised that no thinker can be understood aright without a study of his environment and the whole process of his mental growth, that it is difficult to separate personal from dogmatic detail. The one breathes intelligence into the other and lights it up with meaning.

But while there is not too much history, the history is not only not continuous; it is discontinuous. The order of systems will seem to many readers very arbitrary. From Plato to the Cartesian School, from Malebranche and Spinoza by a sudden leap to Comte; and then, in the second volume, after an elaborate treatment of the author's own views in the face of modern theory as represented by Mr. Mill, Mr. Darwin, Mr. H. Spencer, Mr. Sidgwick, and Mr. Leslie Stephen; back again to Cudworth, Clarke, Shaftesbury, and Hutcheson; is trying to the historical temper. It dislocates not merely

the order of time, but the order of thought, and, as one of Dr. Martineau's critics * has pointed out, leaves the reader without the natural light and instruction which one system throws upon another when seen in historical perspective.

Nothing can be fairer than the author's spirit of criticism, or more subtle and penetrating than his insight into the heart of systems by themselves; but the necessity of selecting types and placing them in bold relief against his own views and against one another without any regard to chronological development has a tendency to harden rather than soften points of relation, and to emphasise the contrarieties rather than the affinities of thought. It is impossible in ethics or in theology to do full justice to opposing opinions without seeing them in their natural growth and order, and tracing them by their links of positive as well as negative association.

But, passing from criticism, let us endeavour to set before our readers, first, Dr. Martineau's method as a philosophic thinker, and then the general tenor of his own ethical doctrine. The two points are intimately connected. The method is the key to the system, and the system is based throughout upon the validity of certain principles and processes implied in the method. So much does the author himself recognise this that he had originally designed that his present treatise should be preceded by a manual of logical psychology explanatory of his ethical groundwork. We cannot regret that such a preliminary labour has not kept Dr. Martineau from issuing the present volumes; there is no end, as he himself indicates, to the necessary preparation for such a task; but we earnestly hope that, notwithstanding his advanced years, we may still have from his pen his promised sequel to the present treatise on 'The Philosophy of Religion,' should 'the evening twilight of life' linger a little longer' with him and leave his 'power of industry still unspent.'

The key to Dr. Martineau's method is found in the broad distinction which he draws between objective and subjective. The facts and laws of physical science, or science properly speaking, as the result of external observation, are objective. But there is a subjective sphere of knowledge no less real. The phenomena of consciousness are no less facts than the phenomena of nature, and consciousness can only be understood by introspection or self-study. This distinc-

* Prof. Sidgwick, in 'Mind,' July.

tion is fundamental throughout his treatise, and more or less explains all its divisions and their nomenclature. He is separated from the Positivist school with whom so much of his polemic is conducted, not merely in details of argument, but critically and in the whole principle of his philosophical procedure. The physical and the ethical spheres are with him entirely separate and can in no way contradict each other. He has much to say by way of criticism against the theory of evolution and its inadequacy to explain ethical phenomena, but the fullest admission of the theory does not touch him from the first, for the simple reason that morality is a distinct emergence in human life—its characteristic feature which cannot be explained away whatever explanation may be given of the organic growth of that life. 'The process of growth in organisms, the extension of this process of development from the thread of the single animal life to the chain of species, supplies new chapters in natural history, but changes not a word in the eternal law of right.' Morality is by itself a fact, which no investigations of physical science can alter or modify.

'Moral existence is not constituted by organism simple or complex or by instincts lodged in it to do its work, but by the presence of a self-conscious, free and reflecting subject to whom both organism and instincts are objective facts; and as no such presence can be alleged in concomitance with the prior animal forms, the evolution misses all contact with the essential prerequisite of morals. Though the modern doctrine, therefore, should widen its conquests till the whole story of nature is recast and every present manual of instruction in the laws of her phenomena is obsolete, the interest in that vast revolution would be purely scientific; without affecting in the least the inner duties and pieties of life.'

It is necessary to understand clearly the initial premiss of Dr. Martineau's thought. It may be questioned how far in these days it is a valid premiss, or rather how far the author is warranted in starting from it without preliminary analysis or defence. But he had this highest of all warrants for his point of departure, that he had reached it through his own experience. He had tried a lower beginning and failed. He had found the physical hypothesis of human nature unworkable. He was driven from it to higher ground by the sheer demands of his moral nature. In the ethical and theological sciences, if any progress is to be made, it is necessary to begin from some definite point of advance. It is impossible to be always turning up the psychological roots, of which they are the offshoots. It is

the whole aim of his treatise besides—of all its history, exposition, and polemic—to show how deeply the roots of a spiritual ethic lie in the soil of human nature and constitute its essence. While he starts on his journey with a postulate which by itself separates him from all physical and metaphysical theorists of morals alike, the result of all his reasoning is to show that his position is not only good in itself, but good especially against every contrary hypothesis.

The data of Ethics are the product of self-interrogation. They can only be given from within. But man is a creature of external environment as well as internal conditions, and the two cannot be separated. Ethics must therefore run out beyond the mere circle of introspection. Not only so; but the key to the various defective types of ethical theory lies just here: that ethical truth has been sought out of man rather than within him—in Nature or in God, the two great objects with which he is contrasted—meaning ‘by the former the totality of perceptible phenomena, and by the latter the eternal ground and cause whose essence they express.’ Whether we begin with man himself, or with either of these objects, makes ‘the whole difference’ between the most opposite schools of opinion, between ancient and modern philosophy.’ In Dr. Martineau’s opinion the special note of all ancient philosophy is its unpsychological character. It began from without. It took its start from the world of phenomena, or the world of Being. Man was not to it the substantive self-conscious personality that he is recognised to be since the introduction of Christianity. He was not the centre of thought, only a part of the system of thought, which sprang either from the changing phenomena or the abiding essence of the universe. This was the only distinction which ancient thinkers acknowledged. All were alike unpsychological; their type of thought was not human but cosmic. All reasoned downwards from the data of the universe to man, and caught him, so to speak, in the sweep of an objective generalisation, instead of starting from man himself and the analysis of his special consciousness. But starting from a common cosmic basis, there were two schools with them as with us—schools allied to the modern but by no means the same. Some ancient thinkers set out from Nature or appearances (phenomena), others from Being or Reality. The antithesis was not, as in the modern schools, between the objective and subjective, or as to whether we can know anything but phenomena, but between phenomena and Being, that which

appears and that which is, the transient and the abiding, *γενόμενα* and *ὄντα*, physics and metaphysics. The controversy might seem, from the terms used, the same as the modern controversy; but in reality it was not so. For it was conducted then entirely upon the field of the universe, and not as now 'upon the enclosure of the human faculties.' The question was not then as to the competency of the human faculties to know anything but phenomena, but as to whether there was anything but phenomena, including man in the whole contents of his being. On the one hand, Protagoras and Epicurus maintained that the whole system of things was only an endless flux of appearances. Parmenides and Zeno, on the other hand, held that 'change and motion, far from being all in all, were impossible, and the totality of being was one immutable and absolute.'

It is of the utmost importance for the correct apprehension of Greek Philosophy, according to Dr. Martineau, that the unlikeness of its method to that of the modern schools should be clearly perceived. The difference is essential and pervades the whole order of ancient and modern thought. The ancient controversy had nothing to do with the competency of our cognitive faculties, which has been the whole question with modern philosophy. The Greek Realist did not begin with the essence of our rational nature and argue outwards. He began with a preconception of the universe as *real*, and argued downwards. With Realist and Phenomenalist alike the starting-point was outside of human nature. Human nature was taken up as a mere part of a general theory or manifestation of a universal idea. In the one case 'the stress of the battle was thrown upon the macro-cosm and fought out between the real and phenomenal, and then the victory was pushed home into human nature; while with the moderns the tug of war is in the microcosm between the maxims of reason and sense, and this outpost being carried, the field of the universe is won.'

This vital difference is especially brought out in ethics. The ideas of the good and the right in Greek philosophy were identical with ideas of the true in science and the beautiful in art. They were alike only manifestation in consciousness of the 'essential principles,' 'the formative thoughts' of the universe 'cropping up on the human stage,' and all 'to be welcomed with the same kind of admiration.' 'This complete merging of all moral approbation in the love of beauty and truth is especially visible in the system of Plato, and has its distinctest expression in his Socratic

'doctrine that virtue is an *ἐπιστήμη* that may be taught.' The idea of personality, out of which a true ethical theory can alone spring, is overborne or suppressed by the general thought that all higher qualities in humanity are not so much self-born as merely transmitted, arising out of 'a community of essence with the realities of the universe'—a 'mere blossoming in the consciousness of man of the real 'root of the eternal universe.'

Dr. Martineau has certainly made the most of this distinction, upon the whole well founded, between the unpsychological character of ancient thought and the self-questioning philosophy of Christendom. It has been questioned how far he is right in attributing to Plato a lack of psychological investigation. He does not, however, go this length. On the contrary, he allows expressly the abundant evidence which the writings both of Plato and Aristotle offer of keen and careful attention to 'the processes of the self-conscious mind.' But with them, as with all ancient thinkers, he says that this was 'the fruit and not the seed of their 'system of belief.' They did not seek their central principles in the study of the human consciousness, and endeavour thence to determine the moral position of man in the universe. Their order of investigation was always the reverse, 'fetching its primary truths from the objective sphere and by 'their help lighting its way through the labyrinth of inner 'thought and experience.'

'Psychological Ethics,' he maintains, 'are *altogether peculiar to Christendom*;' and he traces, with admirable insight and much beauty of expression, the range of this great change in human thought. He is especially successful in explaining how, notwithstanding this change, systematic ethics has been so little cultivated by Christian thinkers. We have seldom read a passage of more pregnant meaning than that in which he describes the negative attitude of the Augustinian theology in this respect. Augustinianism is so great a factor in the history of Christian philosophy that we are apt to take it too much at its own estimate, or rather the estimate of a traditionary criticism which has never really examined all its bearings. As in all his other historical judgements, Dr. Martineau is eminently fair in dealing with this great line of thought, but he also sees its essential weakness—the false emphasis which in its moral earnestness it laid upon the fact of sin, till it left no room for the fact of freedom out of which alone the idea of sin can come.

'The Augustinian theology,' he says, 'is founded upon a sense of

sin so passionate and absolute as to plunge the conscience into unrelieved shadows. It pledges itself to find traces everywhere of the evil condition of humanity in virtue of which there is no longer any freedom for good, and a hopeless taint is mingled with the very springs of our activity. This doctrine is evidently the result of a deep but despairing moral aspiration; it estimates with such stern purity the demands of the Divine Holiness upon us that only the first man fresh with unspoiled powers was capable of fulfilling them; and since he was false, the sole opportunity of voluntary holiness has been thrown away, and we must live in helpless knowledge of obligations which we cannot discharge. Hence there has never been more than one solitary hour of real probation for the human race; during that hour there was a positive trust committed to a capable will, and the young world was under genuine moral administration; but ever since evil only has been possible to human volition, and good can pass no further than our dreams. It follows that as the human game is already lost, we no longer live a probationary life, and can have no doctrine of applied ethics which shall have the slightest religious value; the moralities considered as divine are obsolete as Eden, and human nature, as it is, can produce no voluntary acts that are not relatively neutral because uniformly offensive to the sentiment of God. Its restoration must proceed from sources extraneous to the will, and unless snatched away in some fiery chariot of grace, it must gaze in vain upon the heaven that spreads its awful beauty above the earth. Thus a doctrine which begins with the highest proclamation of the divine law ends with practically superseding it. The history of the universe opens with an act of probation and closes with one of retribution, but through every intervening moment is destitute of moral erudition; and man, the central figure of the whole—though a stately actor at the first and an infinite recipient or victim at the last—so falls through in the meantime between the powers that tempt and those that save him, that as an ethical agent he sinks into nonentity, and becomes the prize contended for by the spirits of darkness and of light. In this system the human personality, by the very intensity with which it burns at its own focus, consumes itself away, and the very attempt to idealise the severity and sanctity of divine law does but cancel it from the actual and banish it to the beginning and end of time. The man of to-day is no free individuality at all, but the mere meeting-point of opposite forces foreign to his will—ruined by nature, rescued by God—with no range of power, therefore none of responsibility between. It is as if the Augustinian system took its doctrine of nature from Protagoras and Epicurus, and its doctrine of grace from Parmenides and Plato.

The whole of Dr. Martineau's first volume is given to a survey of Unpsychologic Ethics, of which, however, only one type is taken from the ancient world. Plato is treated as 'the most well-marked and eminent example of strictly 'metaphysical systems,' that is to say of systems which start from 'certain real eternal existences' as the abiding ground of all phenomena. Plato not only starts from such a Uni-

versal, but his Universal is also above and beyond all phenomena. He is a transcendentalist. Metaphysical Ethics are divisible according as they make the real eternal ground of the universe older than any of its manifestations, and above and beyond them all, so that it is never exhaustible in its outcome, but still always *transcends* the totality of phenomena; or again, as they identify the phenomenal with the real, and make the one merely the garment of the other—its necessary and eternal expression—so that there never has been a time void of phenomena. In the one case, the Divine Cause is conceived as possibly abiding alone; in the other, as eternally going forth in manifestation from its nature; cause is represented as inconceivable without effect. While Transcendency or Transcendentalism is the name given to one type of thought, Immanency is the name given to the other. It is the logical characteristic of the one that while declaring God 'to be the essence of the universe, it 'refuses to convert the proposition and affirm that the 'essence of the universe is God.' It is the logical characteristic of the other, not only to make God to be the essence of the universe, but the essence of the universe to be God.

As Plato is taken to be the specimen of the first of these types of thought, so Aristotle might have been taken as specimen of the other. But Dr. Martineau finds, as might be expected, the most complete expression of the *Immanent* tendency in Spinoza. There is no part of Dr. Martineau's work more thorough than the lengthened study of this great thinker in sequel to Descartes and Malebranche, amounting to 250 pages. He had already published, as is well known, a *monograph* on Spinoza; but his present treatment of the subject is a fresh and independent study, with the advantage of being set in its true historical relations. Our criticism of the lack of historical sequence in his several studies does not apply to this portion of his work, which stands distinct by itself as an elaborate and chronologically connected sketch of the Cartesian School. A hundred pages on Comte completes the first volume and the review of Unpsychological Ethics. Comte of course stands as the most significant type of purely 'physical' Ethics, which may be considered the exact opposite of the 'metaphysical,' while equally resting on an unpsychologic basis. It starts its ethical theory, in short, equally from a ground outside of human nature; but the ground here is not the *real*, but the *phenomenal*. Resolving everything into phenomena, there is, of course, neither in the world nor in man any

Universal, any Permanence. All is merely what it *seems* to be. Knowledge is merely opinion. Man in all his being merely a product of nature and *one of its phenomena*—‘a thread of temporary consciousness spun off from the wheel of a physiologic Fate.’ ‘Act from volition, volition from desire, desire from idea, idea from sensation, sensation from vital connexion with the physical world, form the links by which man is chained to the legislation of material nature.’ The genesis of the doctrines—physical and metaphysical—is entirely different, and it might seem as if they could not meet at any point; and yet, as Dr. Martineau shows, they meet so far in their effects just as they start so far from a common ground or principle. The principle is ideal in the one case, material in the other; but in both cases it is outside of man. It is a preconception enclosing man’s being from the first, and not an induction drawn from the study of his moral consciousness. It is unspiritual, in short, whether from the metaphysical or physical point of view, and therefore inadequate to the interpretation of a spiritual fact. The proper quality of Ethics, or the idea of a responsible will, is ignored by both.

Auguste Comte is in recent times the most thorough-going representative of this tendency. John Stuart Mill, one of his chief interpreters in England, might stand alongside of him. But there is this difference between them. Mill’s ethical doctrine and that of the whole school of English Utilitarians is largely based on psychology. It fights for itself within the sphere of consciousness. Resting no doubt, in the end, on the same preconception as the philosophy of Comte—namely, that man is only a higher development in the animal series without any separate spiritual constitution—it yet tries to establish itself on the basis of man’s personal experience. It does not from the first enclose man within a physical theory, or deny, as Comte does, that there is any true science of psychology at all, or that there is anything to be learned from introspective study. Accordingly Mill and the Utilitarian School of Ethics, from Hobbes downwards, are specially treated under a separate heading as exponents of what Dr. Martineau calls ‘Heteropsychological Theories.’ The Heteropsychologists in Ethics are not theorists of the pure physical type, but theorists rather who misinterpret our psychological experience, who, instead of being content with an unvarnished account ‘of the facts of our moral consciousness and of the beliefs which they implicitly contain,’ insist on explaining them out of prior

unmoral conditions. They are not content to accept as essential and primary such ideas as merit and demerit, obligation and authority, right and wrong. These are, according to them, derivative and not original facts in human nature—facts which have a spiritual look, but are in reality only physical elements in disguise. As Dr. Martineau expresses it in language which here, as elsewhere occasionally, may be felt to sacrifice dignity to familiarity:—

‘Philosophers do not like to be encumbered in their survey of the world with bundles of first truths as numerous as the elements of a lady’s luggage; they cannot move freely till their outfit will all go into a Gladstone bag. So they try to find some one of their packages of thought expansive or elastic enough to hold all that cannot be found superfluous; and as in any case room enough must be left for the senses, which are solid affairs, it is usually the moral sentiments that are apt to get squeezed and to come out at the end hardly recognisable.’

The ethical theory of such philosophers cannot be called un-psychological, because it supports itself or tries to support itself on a psychological basis. Its special task is to show that if we go deep enough into our moral life we shall find the animal root of all our higher sentiments. It joins with the pure physical theory, or that of Comte, in linking at last all moral phenomena to the chain of unbroken natural order; but it differs from it in allowing that there is a valid sphere of internal observation and analysis; so that, as our author says, ‘while nature is monistic, our knowledge of it is dualistic.’

Comte, therefore, is made to stand by himself as the type of the purely physical system of ethics, and claims by himself as such an elaborate treatment at the end of Dr. Martineau’s first volume. Here, as in other cases, he throws much light on his subject. He traces well the influence of Comte’s life and training upon his mental growth; he brings out with special fulness the permanent effects of Comte’s passage through Saint-Simonism; he does justice to Comte’s genius, especially his splendid powers of historical generalisation, while exposing with great acuteness the limits of his thought and the arbitrary absurdity of many of his conclusions. The reader will hardly find anywhere a clearer or more complete estimate of the Comtean ‘system.’ But after all the ethical bearing of the system only furnishes a few pages; and interesting as is the sketch as a whole, it may be doubted whether, as in other parts of the first volume, the author has not somewhat wandered from his

subject, and entertained us with brilliant philosophical effects, rather than with arguments carrying forward his main theory.

It is in Book I. of the second volume, as we have already said, that we reach the statement of Dr. Martineau's own views, and have the light as it were concentrated on certain great principles presupposed throughout the treatise. 'Idio-psychological Ethics' is the name given by the author to his own system. It implies not only that all true ethic is psychological—the fruit of reflective self-knowledge—but that it is self-authenticating. It approves itself by its own conscious utterance, and no analysis which is not at the same time destructive of the moral idea evaporates it. Morality is only the product of a self-conscious mind looking within itself and choosing freely. The recognition of personality, therefore, is its primary condition. Apart from the consciousness of freedom we may use the word morality, but the word has no true meaning. And the consciousness of freedom is the fact of freedom. The fact needs no other proof than that it asserts itself. The phenomenon is genuine because it is there. A moral order can never come out of any mere series of unmoral conditions. It implies a wholly distinct substance, or Self. But bare recognition of self is not enough. Self is only realised under objective conditions. An idealism like Fichte's, which glorifies self as the maker of its own world, of all things, dissipates the essence of morality by destroying the idea of authority. There can be nothing to elicit the moral idea where there is no 'law' 'above and beyond the nature summoned to obey it.' There can be no obedience in such a case.

'Without objective conditions the idea of duty involves a contradiction, and its phraseology passes into an unmeaning figure of speech. Nothing can be *binding* to us that is not higher than we; and to speak of *one part of self imposing obligations on another part*—of one impulse or affection playing as it were *the god* to another—is to trifle with the real significance of the sentiments that speak within us. Conscience does not frame the law, it simply *reveals* the law that holds us. It is an inversion of moral truth to say, for instance, that honour is higher than appetite *because* we feel it so; we feel it to be so because it is so. This "*is*" we know not to be contingent on our apprehension, not to arise from our constitution of faculty; but to be a *reality irrespective of us*, in adaptation to which our nature is constituted.'

It is characteristic of Dr. Martineau's point of view throughout that he acknowledges the ethical consciousness in the fullest sense. It is absolutely distinct and answers

for itself. It is not something else in disguise, or a mere growth from something different. It is a new *moment* in human life—a consciousness of freedom—a consciousness of moral relation. In the very fact of self-consciousness we have *other-consciousness*. And this is real knowledge. The sense of duty is as real to us as any perceptible phenomenon. Our other-consciousness is no less real, and no less truly shows its own character. It is no mere impersonal law, or law originating with ourselves. It is an authority higher than ourselves, or a personal authority. 'It is *self* and *God* that stand face to face.' The psychological experience is essentially dualistic, and the dualism is spiritual. 'I am deeply persuaded,' he adds, 'that no monistic scheme, whether its starting point be *Self*, or *Nature*, or *God*, can ever interpret, without distorting or expunging, the facts on which our nature and life are built.'

Setting out from these postulates, Dr. Martineau might seem to beg the whole question against his opponents; and so in a certain sense he does, as already implied. The pre-conceptions underlying his system are everywhere at variance with those which meet us in modern ethical theories as expounded by Mr. Sidgwick, Mr. Leslie Stephen, Mr. Herbert Spencer, and others. The monistic tendency—the tendency to spin out the whole web of human life from a single starting point—is uppermost with them. Here, as so often in speculation, the long-waged controversy may be said to terminate in a dogmatism on either side, and with this disadvantage to Dr. Martineau, that his position is now pronounced 'an obsolete form of speculation.' But, in truth, the spiritual moralist is infinitely less of a dogmatist than the materialistic theorist. He, at least, begins with the obvious interpretation of the fundamental facts as contained in consciousness. Not only so, but it is the whole aim of the elaborate analysis contained in both these volumes, and especially in the second volume, to show that no other interpretation will fit into all the wards of the case, so to speak, and answer to its meaning. It would have been no great service for a veteran thinker like Dr. Martineau merely to have set up again the overthrown altar of theological ethics; but he has not only done this with a brave trust in the ancient fire of consecration which has so long burned upon this altar. He has, above all, shown that no other altar can be reared consistently with a true interpretation of the facts of human nature. He has not built his altar of traditionary stones; he has not merely set

up theory against theory; but he has gone into the whole arcana of human nature and shown how impossible it is to explain it apart from the old spiritual ideas of freedom and God. He has brought these ideas with him, indeed—as who can divest himself of them at this stage of human progress?—but he has substantiated them afresh on a psychological basis formidable in its strength. It may be possible to dispute the basis altogether, to set aside distinctive moral ideas as at variance with modern science (although a position of this kind can only be that of a sciolist and not of a thinker); but accepting a psychological basis for ethics—or, in other words, granting that the conditions of man's higher life can only be fully understood by allowing that higher life to speak for itself—it is impossible not to feel that these volumes make out a powerful and, as it seems to us, irresistible case against any mere naturalistic interpretation of that life.

Having set forth his postulates, Dr. Martineau develops at length the contents of what he calls the 'ethical fact': first, the '*objects of moral judgement*;' and second, the '*mode of moral judgement*.' It is impossible for us to follow him in his elaborate discussion of these points, and still less to follow him in his extremely subtle analysis of the difference between the ethical and merely *prudential* idea; his discrimination of the true nature of *moral authority* (in which he draws out and further substantiates his spiritual basis as the only really working basis of morality); his lengthened classification of the *springs of action*, first in their *psychological* and then in their *moral* order. These discussions embrace the larger portion of his second volume. We can only draw attention to what may be called the author's special contribution to a higher ethical doctrine, namely, the emphasis with which he fixes upon the inward personal character of all moral judgement; and, again, the *conditions of conflict* out of which all such judgement arises.

The ethical judgement has always relation to *persons*, and not things. If intuition and personality could be conceived blotted from the universe, morality would disappear. When we approve the products of nature and art, we really approve of them as the expression of mind. It is only as we lift the external world into this personal element that we speak of rocks as *stern*, of the stream as *joyous*.

'Once let either negation be put upon this personal element, and the universe appear before us as without an inner meaning, as a mere play of fatalistic forces, and this phraseology loses all truth. . . .

That we give these words to things, and then first feel their true nature struck, only proves how ready we are to refer back all things to a Personal Being behind them.'

And this personal element is of the very essence of all ethical judgement.

'The approbation or disapprobation which we feel towards human action is directed upon them as *personal phenomena*, and if this condition failed would disappear, though they might still as natural causes be instrumental in producing much good or ill. Their moral character goes forward with them out of the person, and is not reflected back upon them from their effects.'

Accordingly, morality is essentially *inward*. It is the *inner spring* of action, and not at all its outward results, that we mean when we speak of any action as moral. And in this definition all modern theorists, from Mr. Herbert Spencer to 'the Hegelian moralist, Mr. F. H. Bradley,' virtually agree. It is action on its inner side, or in reference to the sentiment from which it springs, and not in reference to mere muscular movement or the consequence of that movement, that we characterise as moral or immoral. And we pronounce this judgement primarily of our own experience. It comes to us as a generalisation from within, and not from without; from self-reflection, and not from observation. Dr. Martineau confesses that he here diverges from the great majority of English moralists. It is a necessary principle of the Utilitarian school that we learn morality from usage. We approve acts which benefit us or others, and hence by analogy transfer praise and blame to acts of our own. The 'moral 'consciousness' is a social product both with Mr. Herbert Spencer and his disciple Mr. Leslie Stephen. It comes *ab extra*. We are shocked at gluttony, for example, because imaginatively we realise its degrading effects in ourselves from seeing them in others. But a theory of this kind, as Dr. Martineau points out, is inconsistent with the former position recognised more or less by all schools, viz. that the moral quality resides in the inner spring of action. If we had not already within ourselves a note of experience corresponding with the results of observation in others, these results would be unmeaning. It is light within that alone flashes light without, so that we read off by inference the outward sign. It is not meant, of course, that in the moral sphere any more than in the cognitive sphere the *within* and *without* stand apart. They are interinvolved in the very nature of the case, and as a condition of human development on every side. The subjective only discovers itself in

contact with the objective and *vice versâ*; but this does not give the objective factor any priority of time or causality. That our personality only comes into play against nature does not place it behind nature as its product. That ethical feeling can only be educated in contact with the world does not make ethical judgement a result of external criticism. The primary criticism is from within. Self-estimation is the key to all other estimation. The awakened self-consciousness carries with it of its own inherent essence the self-judgement in which moral sentiment consists, and the judgement passes on to others simply as of the same nature with ourselves. 'Upon this principle,' our author adds, 'I should be inclined to fix as the most certain test 'by which to discriminate true from false theories of morals.' Thinkers who disagree here can never approximate.

But he further well points out that the mere inwardness or spontaneity of a principle does not give it a moral character any more than the aptitudes of spontaneous genius constitute wisdom. Character could never be formed out of mere spontaneities of impulse. Besides spontaneity there must be volition, and volition only comes into play in the presence of conflicting impulses. Our moral life is essentially a process of preference, in which we pass our impulses under review and pass a verdict. Without entering on the old controversy of liberty and necessity, it is plain, therefore, that 'either free-will is a fact, or moral judgement 'a delusion.' There can be no exercise of the judgement save in the presence of rival claims upon our will. 'It is not 'till two incompatible impulses appear in our consciousness 'and contest the field, that we are made aware of their 'difference, and are driven to judge between them.'

It is the special business of conscience to discriminate the true from the false claim upon our will, the higher and worthier from the lower impulse. Every impulse has so far a right to gratification. It is only within us as a part of our nature. But we are also able by nature to see that our impulses are on a graduated scale of excellence. Conscience represents within us this capacity. It is '*the knowledge with 'ourselves* of the better and the worse.' Whoever feels no difference of worth between one propension and another, and yields himself with equal unreluctance to appetite or affection, to resentment or compassion, and emerges from them 'with equal cheerfulness, is without conscience.' There is much that is searching in Dr. Martineau's analysis of conscience; but there is also, as there is apt to be in treating

of this faculty, some confusion. It is, according to its name, an organ of discernment—"the mere inner sense of 'differences along the scale of impulses, without regard to 'the absolute force of any.' It does not make the *authority*; it only reveals it. But, as with Butler, the idea of authority becomes mixed up with the mere discrimination of the good. We doubt if it is possible to keep the two apart. The good cannot be seen without its claim to us being recognised. It is authoritative because good. The one idea lies involved in the other, although it be strictly true that the note of authority really comes from behind, and is a revelation to us from a higher will, and no mere self-product.

This is so favourite a thought with Dr. Martineau, and so important in itself, that we must give a special passage bearing upon it:—

'Mere egoism,' he argues, 'can never evolve the sense of duty. No mere "splitting the mental constitution into a plurality of principles or faculties" can establish a relation of "superior and inferior." For surely if the sense of authority means anything it means the discernment of something *higher than we*, having claims on our *self*—therefore no mere part of it—hovering over and transcending our personality, although also mingling with our consciousness and manifested through its intervention. If I rightly interpret this sentiment, I cannot therefore stop within my own limits, but am irresistibly carried on to the recognition of another than I. Nor does that other remain without further witness; the predicate "higher than I" takes me yet a step beyond; for what am I? A person, "higher" than whom no "thing" assuredly, no mere phenomenon, can be; but only *another Person*, greater and higher and of deeper insight. In the absence of society or human companionship we are then still held in the presence of one having moral affinity with us; by retiring into ourselves we find that we are transported out of ourselves and placed beneath the light of a Diviner countenance.'

There is of course nothing new in this line of argument, nor does Dr. Martineau claim novelty for this or indeed any part of his ethical doctrine.* What is really new in

* There is no part of Dr. Martineau's positive contribution to ethical doctrine more fresh than his analysis of the *necessity of conflict* as a condition of the moral question. This question only emerges when competing felicities present themselves to our volition. But there is nothing absolutely new even in their doctrine. Not to say that it was already implied in Butler, it has been admirably expounded in a recent volume of great force of thought and scientific precision of analysis, under the title of 'Ethica' or 'The Ethics of Reason.' This volume bears to be by 'Scotus Novanticus,' author of a preceding volume (1884) entitled 'Metaphysica Nova et Vetusta.' Both volumes are

the treatise is the vivid and often brilliant light and rich variety of argument in which he has set the subject, more than all perhaps the ingeniously illustrative polemic which he has brought to bear upon opposing theories. We have in this latter respect done very imperfect justice to his work.

Nothing is more difficult to summarise than the diversified force of some of his replies to the hedonistic theories of ethics based upon evolution; and a summary of them after all would give no adequate idea of the manner in which he hunts their sophistries through many pages, and mercilessly exposes them. We give only one specimen of the manner in which he himself sums up a course of lengthened argument, chiefly with Mr. Spencer.

‘It is plain from this survey of the process of evolution that we have just as much reason for trusting the sense of right with the postulate of objective authority which it carries, as for believing in the components of the rainbow or the infinitude of space. Those ideas are all acquisitions in the sense that there was a time when they were not to be found in the creatures from which we descend. They are all evolved in the sense that gradually, and one by one, they cropped up into consciousness amid the crowd of feelings which they entered as strangers. They are all original or *sui generis* in the sense that they are intrinsically dissimilar to the predecessors with which they mingle, so that by no rational scrutiny could you out of the contents of their predecessors invent and preconceive them any more than you can predict the psychology of a million years hence. Whence then the strange anxiety to get rid of their originality and assimilate again what you had registered as a differentiation? You say that when you undress the “moral intuition” and lay aside fold after fold of its disguise you find nothing at last but naked pleasure and utility; then how is it that no foresight, with largest command of psychologic clothes, would enable you to invert the experiment, and dress up those nudities into the august form of Duty? To say that the conscience is but the compressed contents of an inherited calculus of the agreeable and the serviceable is no better than for one who had been colour-blind to insist that the red which he has gained is nothing but his familiar green with some queer mask. It cannot be denied that the sense of right has earned its separate name, by appearing to those who have it and speak of it to one another essentially different from the desire of pleasure, from the perception of related means and ends, and from coercive fear. Why not, therefore, frankly leave it its proper place as

marked by much vigour and lucidity, grasp of philosophic distinctions, and capacity of following and combining threads of thought to their end. We observe them announced since their first publication as the production of Professor Laurie of Edinburgh; and we have pleasure in recommending them to the attention of all students in philosophy.

a new differentiation of voluntary activity? Why pretend against all fact that it is homogeneous with self-interest, instead of accepting it as the key to a moral order of cognition and system of relations supplementing the previous sentient and intellectual and affectional experiences? Unless we so accept it we are driven to the unsatisfactory task of explaining away the characteristics of our nature which are admitted to lie on its meridian of culmination; of plucking off the mask of divine authority from duty and of human freedom from responsibility; of cancelling obligation except in the vaguer sense—"If you want to walk you must use your legs"; of interpreting altruistic claims as transfigured self-concern; and of reducing moral law from ultimate to instrumental; so that whatever of higher tone or more ideal aspect is superinduced upon the sentient and instinctive foundation comes to be regarded as a species of rhetorical exaggeration and æsthetic witchery by which we are *tricked* into serving one another and forgetting our self-love. For my part, I object to be led blindfold through the cunning of nature into sham sacrifices and heroisms, even though they should land me in a real heaven, much more when I find that they replace me among "appetising" creatures, with only the added knowledge that I am a dupe into the bargain. *Better far to trust the veracity of nature*, and accept the independent reality of the moral relations it discloses as loyally as those laid open by the perceptive and intellectual evolution. The idea of a *higher* is as much entitled to be believed as that of an outer, the *right* as the true, and both are distinct from the pleasant.' (Vol. ii. p. 362.)

We have barely touched the fringe of the author's felicitous comments upon the writings of Mr. Herbert Spencer, Mr. Leslie Stephen, Professor Sidgwick, and others. But our space is already exhausted, and we must refer our readers to the volumes themselves.

It only remains to us to express once more our admiration of the vigour and freshness, the profundity, subtlety and interest of thought which they show on every page, and to congratulate the venerable author on the length of years which have not indeed brought to him 'the philosophic mind'—for it was there from the beginning—but which have ripened his powers into such rich and copious fruitage.

- ART. VIII.—1. *Address of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., to the Electors of Midlothian*, September, 1885.
2. *The Radical Programme*, with a Preface by the Right Hon. JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN, M.P., September, 1885.
3. *Peasant Properties and other Selected Essays*. By Lady VERNEY. 2 vols. London: 1885.
4. *Socialism at St. Stephen's*, 1869–1885. A speech delivered by the Earl of WEMYSS in the House of Lords, July 31, 1885.
5. *Return of the Number of Assessments to the Income Tax, from April 1875 to April 1884, under Schedules D and E*.
6. *Report of the Committee of Council on Education (England and Wales)*, 1884–5. 2 vols. 8vo. London: 1885.

WHEN the Curate and the Barber revisited Don Quixote after his second expedition, we are informed by the veracious Cid Hamet Benengeli that ‘they fell to discussing ‘what they call Statecraft and systems of government, correcting this abuse and condemning that, reforming one ‘practice and abolishing another, each of the three setting ‘up for a new legislator, a modern Lycurgus or a brand-new ‘Solon; and so completely did they remodel the State, that ‘they seemed to have thrust it into a furnace and taken out ‘something quite different from what they had put in.’* If there was so much Radicalism in La Mancha nearly three centuries ago, what shall we say to the political discussions going on in England in the nineteenth century, on the eve of a general election? The curate and the barber are at it still, and with much the same result. Everybody talks politics, thinks politics, and will soon be called upon to perform an act of citizenship. Never was it more important to clear men’s minds of popular fallacies, to avoid ‘the madness of ‘extremes,’ to shun delusions as fantastical as the dreams of Don Quixote, and to act with judgement, honesty, and prudence.

The word ‘politics’ has gradually acquired a double signification, but nothing is more distinct than these two meanings. In the more vulgar sense politics are a struggle for personal power by party contests; they breathe defiance

* We quote from Mr. John Ormsby’s admirable translation of the great Spanish classic, which enables the English reader to follow the adventures of Don Quixote with fresh spirit and pleasure.

to opponents; the passions are stimulated by platform oratory and by party organisation; a shortlived social war rages through the land; wild theories are broached; false promises are made; and it would seem as if the most solemn and important act which the nation can be called upon to perform was to be accomplished by noise, excitement, and intemperate language. But the word 'politics' has a higher import. It is not so much the conflict and the triumph of one set of men over another, as the trial of the principles which govern States and Empires. The statesman is bound by the stern obligations of truth and duty—as Cicero said of Cato, 'Dicit tanquam in Platonis Πολιτεία, 'non tanquam in Romuli fæce, sententiam;' the politician of the day is an opportunist, whose motives are personal, and whose opinions are as light and capricious as the passions of the crowd he addresses. Political science will raise a nation to the highest point of freedom, prosperity, and power. Political ignorance leads to the dissolution not only of great monarchies, but of society. The government of the United Kingdom has been conducted, for the last half-century, on sound political principles, progressive without being destructive, conservative without being stationary or retrograde. And we see no unfavourable result. We have not the slightest apprehension that Liberal principles will cease to govern the policy of the Empire, whatever may be the colour of the executive ministers of the Crown; for in truth it is the old Toryism of former days that is extinct and impossible, not the principles of moderate liberal government, to which all the statesmen of the present day are paying a willing or an unconscious homage.

But beyond them, and in opposition to them, a considerable party has sprung up, which claims to exercise a vast influence on public affairs. As we endeavoured to show upon a recent occasion, their ends and their means of action are totally at variance with those of the Liberal party. The Liberal party works within the lines of the Constitution, which it seeks to perfect and maintain. The Radical leaders make no secret of their intention to destroy it. The Liberal party rests upon the joint action of the diverse elements of society, and on principles of equal justice. The Radical creed tolerates no division of authority, and would willingly invest the House of Commons with the arbitrary authority of the Long Parliament, in order to accomplish what must be regarded as a revolution—a revolution which can never be effected as long as the fundamental institutions

of the realm remain unchanged. These are the very pillars and barriers on which the temperate legislation and executive power of England rest; and before more violent measures can be carried they must be swept away. To defend these institutions from aggression is quite as much in the interest of the Liberal party as of any other body in the State, for their overthrow would be the inlet of arbitrary power, and of arbitrary power of the worst kind—the power of ignorance, of corruption, of intolerance, and of misguided passions. It is the curse of democracy that its leaders, whether by faction or by ignorance, seek to pervert the judgement of the people by false theories and delusive expectations. We must rely on the good sense of the people of England to detect and defeat these fallacies. Power can only be exercised for their benefit in the measure of their wisdom. The point on which the welfare of a nation depends is whether its wisdom is commensurate with its power. We rejoice to find that these sentiments are in accordance with those of Mr. Gladstone in his Address to the Electors of Midlothian, which was published on September 18. He adopts the saying of Mr. Burke, that knowledge and virtue alone have an intrinsic right to govern—a truism which is sometimes in danger of being forgotten. This remarkable Address is in great part an *Apologia pro vitâ suâ* of the venerable author, an apology which is not needed by his numerous friends and admirers, and which will not disarm the censure of his opponents. In fullness of detail it leaves nothing to be desired. But the most striking feature in it is that it holds out no sort of encouragement to the far-reaching schemes of the Radical party, with which we are about to deal; and although there are three or four of them which it honours with a cursory notice, all such organic changes in the Constitution are relegated by Mr. Gladstone to a remote future, beyond the horizon of his own political existence. It is impossible to suppose that Mr. Gladstone, with his antecedents, his large experience, his great intellect, and his attachment, which we believe to be sincere, to the institutions of the country, can share the delusions or the designs of his Radical followers. He cannot desire to subvert the financial system which is his own work and deserves to rank amongst his most successful achievements. He cannot seek to throw enormous charges on the taxpayer by the destruction of the voluntary system of elementary education. He is not insensible to the dangers and absurdities of an agrarian law. On these points, which are

put prominently forward, we confidently rely on his support of sound principles of legislation, and the language of his Address shows, that if his name is used by Radical candidates to endorse such proposals, that name is taken in vain, and that he is more likely to defeat their schemes than to abet them. His influence over the Radical party and his alliance with their leaders have been used to control not to stimulate them: and we infer from his guarded language on this occasion, that his real object is to moderate and restrain the course of legislation within the bounds of right and reason. In this respect, his Address is identical with the excellent speech delivered by Lord Hartington at Rosendale, which we accept as the true programme of the Liberal party, and to which we cordially adhere.

Not so Mr. Chamberlain. He tells us in plain language that the political revolution is now accomplished and that the social revolution must be begun. 'The stage of agitation has passed,' he says, 'and the time for action is come.' What he means by action is fully set forth in the little volume entitled 'The Radical Programme' which is now before us. As everything cannot be done at once, he selects these topics for the immediate action of the Radical Party—graduated taxation, free schools maintained by the State, and an agrarian law for the compulsory purchase of land, so that the purchaser is to fix the price and the public to advance the purchase money. With a consistency which we respect, he has publicly pledged himself not to accept office in any Government which is not prepared to adopt and carry these measures. There is therefore no doubt or obscurity as to the relative positions of the two sections of the Liberal party; Mr. Chamberlain has defined with absolute clearness what we had termed metaphorically 'the parting of the waters.'

We do not propose, however, to discuss the personal claims of the leaders in the approaching contest. These are not questions of personal confidence but of political principle. Men are apt to be governed too much by the name of this or that champion, who may command their sympathy or excite their animosity. We shall rather endeavour in the following pages to consider the meaning and value of the measures proposed by the advanced section of the Liberal Party in themselves, without reference to personal pretensions or even to mere party interests, and for this purpose we shall content ourselves with quoting the exact terms of the programme of a Radical candidate for no less a place

than the city of Westminster, which are circulated upon a card and with an address, with which we have been favoured. They are as follows; and it should be observed that they are put forth with the authority of a body calling itself the Westminster Borough Committee, whatever that may mean:—

Abolition of the House of Lords.

Disestablishment and Disendowment of State Churches.

Home Rule for England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland.

Abolition of Parliamentary Oaths.

Graduated Income Tax.

Radical Reform of Land Laws.

One Municipality for London.

Extinction of City Companies.

Endowments for Education of Poor to be restored to their right use.

Local Option.

Elementary Education Free and Nonsectarian.

No further extension of the Empire by War or otherwise.

Triennial Parliamentary Elections.

No more Royal Dowries or Pensions.

Abolition of Game Laws.

Taxation of Ground Landlords.

It is scarcely necessary to remark that none of the more important of these propositions have ever been put forward or accepted by any of the Liberal Governments or Legislatures which have existed in this country for the last fifty years. On the contrary, they have been steadily opposed and rejected till the present time by every statesman who has borne the responsibility of public affairs. They therefore form no part of the Liberal creed, as it has hitherto been understood, and for these reasons. Some of them are directly opposed to the best established truths of political economy. Some of them are inconsistent with the elementary principles of law and morality. Some of them strike at the root of individual freedom and the rights of property. Some of them would substitute the arbitrary control of the State for the independent action of corporate bodies and individuals. Some of them would occasion an inordinate increase of taxation. Most of them would tend to subvert the existing fabric of society; and we confidently affirm that, far from benefiting the mass of the people and conferring increased prosperity, happiness, and power on the nation, the adoption of measures of this description would

have precisely the opposite effect, and would lead to pauperism, distress, and anarchy. By this test, and this alone, we shall try them. We shall say nothing of historical tradition, of vested interests, of monarchical, aristocratical, or ecclesiastical rights, although these are as substantial grounds of a settled policy as any human institution can be. Undoubtedly, *salus populi suprema lex*, and reforms clearly calculated to promote the welfare of the people cannot, and ought not to be, resisted on the score of class interests. But we hold most of these propositions to be dangerous popular fallacies, false in principle and pernicious in their results. And as some, though not all of them, are advocated at the present time by men who claim to represent the most advanced opinions of the Liberal party, we shall examine them in succession, and endeavour to show that candidates who solicit the suffrages of the electors on such terms as these are the enemies of the Liberal party and of their country.

But before we proceed with our task, we must point out the principle which overrules all these proposals; namely, the extension and exercise of the power of the State to interfere with private rights, with private property, and with personal freedom. Nothing can be plainer than the language sanctioned by Mr. Chamberlain and his friends:—

‘The principle of all such legislation as is now being considered is the right and duty of the State to fix within certain broad limits the extent, and to control the conditions, of private ownership. *What therefore must be done is formally to confer upon the State larger powers in these matters than she now possesses.*’ [The italics are in the text.] (P. 57.)

And again—

‘It is needless now to attempt to define the measures which may be necessary for these ends. It is enough to indicate their general character. They sound the death-knell of the *laissez-faire* system; and if the agricultural labourer is not strong enough to look after himself, to take the initiative in the social reforms prompted by a rational estimate of private interest, there is an organised body of politicians in this country who will at least do thus much for him. If it be said that this is communism, the answer is that it is not. If it be said that it is legislation of a socialist tendency, the impeachment may readily be admitted.’ (P. 13.)

We are obliged to Mr. Chamberlain for stating his views so distinctly. There is no disguise about the matter; and in the following chapter of this little volume the problem of what he calls the ‘Revolution of 1885’ is worked out with

equal clearness. His ideal is the all-pervading authority of the State, wielded by 'an organised body of politicians,' to control the rights and liberties of man. We reply, briefly, that such an authority would be the most odious and intolerable form of despotism ever invented by a tyrant, for it would track men to their homes and their hearths, it would enslave their industry, limit the disposal of their gains, and impoverish their posterity. Such doctrines are not only absolutely opposed to the principles of the old Liberal party (which Mr. Chamberlain conceives to be on the verge of extinction), but they are fatal to liberty itself.*

'It is not,' said Lord Macaulay, 'by the intermeddling of the omnipotent and omniscient State, but by the prudence, energy, and foresight of its inhabitants, that England has been hitherto carried forward in civilisation; and it is to the same energy, prudence, and foresight that we shall look forward with comfort and good hope. Our rulers will best promote the improvement of the nation by strictly confining themselves to their own legitimate duties, by leaving capital to find its most lucrative course, commodities their fair price, industry and intelligence their natural reward, idleness and folly their natural punishment; by maintaining peace, by defending property, by diminishing the price of law, and by observing strict economy in every department of the State. Let the Government do this, and the people will assuredly do the rest.'

1. We are not surprised that the first condition of the pure democratic programme is the abolition of the House of Lords, either by the total extinction of the Second Chamber, or by the substitution of an elected body for the present House, which is composed in part of the hereditary peerage, and in part of the nominees of the Crown—men chosen for their official position or for their talents and their services to the State. For it is evident that this measure is an essential preliminary to the introduction of revolutionary changes and attacks on law and property, which no independent branch of the legislature would sanction. The object of democracy is the establishment of unlimited power. It is of the essence of the British Constitution and of

* Lord Wemyss is a Tory, and somewhat of a free lance; but we forgive him his Toryism in consideration of the energy with which he has denounced and exposed the progress of 'State-Socialism,' and the astonishing amount of interference which has already been sanctioned by Parliament with almost every branch of industry. We have, therefore, placed his speech at the head of this article, and we are indebted to him for the remarkable quotation from Lord Macaulay which follows in the text.

freedom itself that no power in the State should be unlimited and uncontrolled by co-ordinate authorities. All the authors of free constitutions have sought to obviate the dangers of the unlimited power of the majority by the establishment of barriers capable of resisting the hasty and headlong impulse of popular passion, not governed by justice, wisdom, or even knowledge. That, indeed, is the great problem of democratic government and of a democratic age; for it is obvious that the barriers to democratic impulse, being weaker than the democracy itself, run great risk of being overthrown by it. In the Federal Constitution of the United States this problem was solved with admirable success by the creation of the Senate, but even that august institution is now threatened by the most radical party in America. In the constitutions of the several States a second chamber exists; but as it is elected by the same constituencies as the first chamber, its controlling power is a nullity. In England, as has recently been shown by an eminent writer in the 'Quarterly Review,' the moment we travel beyond the lines of the Constitution, there is a singular absence of the restraining element which exists in America and some other countries. The alternative lies between the institutions we possess and the absolutism of a democratic convention. What the result of such a government would be may most fitly be stated in the language of M. de Tocqueville in his immortal chapter on the unlimited power of the majority.

'It has been asserted that a people can never entirely outstrip the boundaries of justice and of reason in those affairs which are more peculiarly its own, and that consequently full power may fearlessly be given to the majority by which it is represented. But this language is that of a slave. A majority taken collectively may be regarded as a being whose opinions, and most frequently whose interests, are opposed to those of another being, which is styled a minority. If it be admitted that a man possessing absolute power may misuse that power by wronging his adversaries, why should a majority not be liable to the same reproach? Men are not apt to change their characters by agglomeration; nor does their patience in presence of obstacles increase with the consciousness of strength. And for these reasons I can never willingly invest any number of my fellow-creatures with that unlimited authority which I should refuse to any one of them. . . . Unlimited power is in itself a bad and dangerous thing; human beings are not competent to exercise it with discretion, and God alone can be omnipotent because His wisdom and His justice are always equal to His power. But no power on earth is so worthy of honour for itself, or of reverential obedience to the rights it represents, that I would consent to admit its uncontrolled and all-predominant authority. When

I see the right and the means of absolute command are conferred on a people or upon a king, upon an aristocracy or a democracy, a monarchy or a republic, I recognise the germ of tyranny, and I journey onwards to a land of more hopeful institutions.' *

These are the sentiments and principles of a true Liberal and a patriot.

The House of Lords supplies, as far as the imperfection of all human institutions permits, precisely the moderate controlling power which is adapted to the circumstances of this country. It is not a purely hereditary Chamber on the one hand, nor a body of Crown nominees on the other. Its hereditary character secures its independence, and it is continually reinforced by men whose talents have raised them from the Commons to the highest rank in the church, the law, the army, the navy, and the public service. This element might be increased by a larger creation of life peerages, for which much is to be said. Its debates are wise, eloquent, and brief. Its business is conducted with consummate ability and despatch. The power it exercises is strong enough to resist acts of imprudence, injustice, or unconstitutional violence; but not so strong as to oppose or defeat the deliberate and just demands of public opinion. As the Liberal party has been in power, with only two important exceptions, for fifty years, the additions to the peerage by Liberal ministers largely outnumber those of their political opponents. Lastly, if ever there was a time when the controlling power of a Second Chamber is likely to be most needed, it is when the democratic element in the House of Commons has been enlarged, and when wild schemes, like those now before us, are thrown out by demagogues to excite and delude the people.

2. The first of these schemes, and that which we are told is most extensively used as a democratic war-cry at the coming elections, is the Disestablishment and Disendowment of the Church. It is said that four hundred Liberal candidates have pledged themselves to some such measure in order to gain the votes of the Nonconformists. If this be true we are sorry to hear it, for many of these gentlemen must be Churchmen, and they can neither have realised the extreme difficulty and danger of such an interference with Church property, nor its disastrous consequences. In some rural districts leaflets have been distributed to persuade the peasantry that the overthrow of the Established Church and

the confiscation of its property would confer on every labouring man two or three acres of land and a cottage to live in; and we hear that the same gross delusion has been propagated by the peripatetic emissaries of the Caucus. We shall say nothing on this occasion of the higher arguments by which the National Church may be defended—its spiritual and sacred character, its ancient traditions, its government and control by the law of the land and the supremacy of the Crown; its broad and tolerant spirit; its services to the education and morals of the people. Nor need we point out that the overthrow of the great Anglican establishment—the head and front of the Protestant churches of the Reformation—would be regarded as the most stupendous triumph which the Church of Rome has obtained for three centuries, and would largely increase her power in these islands. Nor shall we enlarge on the gross injustice of an attack on the property of the greatest and oldest corporate body in the country—property not at all derived from the State or from taxation of the people, but held by the most ancient independent tenure, devoted to the noblest purposes, and largely increased in recent times by enormous voluntary contributions from its members.* The sums freely given to the Church of England, for her uses and purposes, within the last half-century, amount to many millions. To all this property the State has no better claim than it would have to confiscate the funds or estates of a college or a hospital. But we are content to defend the maintenance of the National Church on the lowest possible ground, simply that of its public utility. Would the disestablishment and disendowment of the Church confer the smallest advantage on the masses of the people? Would it not rather deprive them of one of the most valuable institutions they possess?

It is scarcely worth while to notice the absurd delusion that the disestablishment of the Church would confer any pecuniary benefit on the people. To suppose that the lands or the funds of the Church would be distributed among the peasantry is so audacious and absurd a pretence, that it can

* Incredible as such ignorance may appear to be, it is a common belief amongst members of the so-called 'Liberation Society' that a State Church means a Church paid by the State; therefore we emphatically repeat that, since the abolition of church rates, no portion of the public taxes or rates is appropriated to the Church or the clergy. The payments made to the chaplains of gaols, unions, and the army or navy are not confined to the Established Church, but are shared by other religious denominations.

hardly impose on the grossest ignorance; but this argument of agrarian communism has not been unused by Radical agitators in the rural districts. The rent-charge on land in lieu of tithe, which is now devoted to the maintenance of the clergy and the spiritual wants of the parishioners, would still be paid. If it were abolished it would become the property of the landowner, in the shape of rent; if it were confiscated by the State it would be devoted to secular purposes, and to purposes which would lose much of their local application.

The disestablishment of the Church would go far to destroy the parochial system in the rural parishes of England. As long as the Church retains its character of a national institution, the rector or vicar of the parish is its official head. He is looked up to not only as a minister of religion, but as the person who promotes its schools, its charities, as well as the moral, and even the temporal, welfare of the parish. In the vast majority of English parishes the clergyman and his family are the most enlightened and the most charitable members of the little community. They are, by position and character, the friends of the poor, to relieve their wants, to assist them with advice, to comfort them in adversity, sickness, and the hour of death. The poor have a rightful claim upon their pastor, which is not unheeded. We have reason to know that the duties of the visitation of the sick and the relief of the poor, which are daily performed by the parochial clergy, fall much more lightly on the ministers of the dissenting congregations. The late Earl Cairns used to say that, with reference to the livings in the gift of the Lord Chancellor, he believed that the clergy gave more of their own substance to the Church than the Church gives to the clergy. Disestablish the Church and destroy the official and independent position of the ministers of the Church, and all this is changed. The incumbent would cease to be the parson, the *person* of the parish. He must be supported by voluntary contributions, paid by those to whom he now owes a gratuitous service. His means would be restricted, and he would no longer be willing or able to contribute a large support to the schools and charities of his flock. Those charges must be thrown on the rates. He would lose the rank and *status* which make him the most considerable person in the parish, and he would be liberated from the duties which that *status* imposes upon him. The distinction between the clergyman of the National Church and the dissenting minister, which excites the jealousy and

sometimes the rancour of the dissenting bodies, is that the nonconformist minister is the head of his own congregation, depending on their voluntary support or on the peculiar organisation of his sect, whilst the clergyman is the servant of the parish, bound to assist all who may require his offices, without fee or reward from the people. No one can now suppose that men take orders and assume the duties of a parish priest for the sake of clerical emoluments. The clerical is the worst paid of all the liberal professions. In the lower ranks of the clergy the income is not much above that of an upper servant, and even the more fortunate of the beneficed clergy could easily take their talents to a more lucrative market. It is the *status* of the clergy and the desire to perform duties which are respected and honourable in the sight of God and man, which induce men of piety, ability, and a high sense of duty, to take orders. The inevitable result of the disestablishment of the Church would be that the clerical profession would be lowered, and that men of the highest character, station, and ability would cease to enter it.

About two-thirds of the elementary schools in England and Wales are maintained by Churchmen and the clergy, not to mention the innumerable parochial charities which exist in the country. The effect of the disendowment of the Church, which now contributes so largely to these institutions, would be that large sums now devoted to educational and charitable purposes must be withdrawn from them to be applied to the maintenance of the clergy and the church fabrics, so that the poorer parishioners would lose on the one hand far more than they could possibly gain on the other by any confiscation of Church property.

It is curious that the keenest opponents of the National Church are at this very time eager to raise a rival establishment, at the expense of the State, for the education of the people. The Church of England is a school—a school of faith and morals. Her influence and instruction are not confined to children between eight and thirteen years of age; we are all her scholars, and we remain so all the days of our life. Her teaching is the guardian and the guide of social duty. Many nations have been great without scientific knowledge, for true science is barely two hundred and fifty years' old; but none have flourished, or continued to exist, without faith and morals. The modern theory is to substitute secular and scientific knowledge for these traditions. The secularists would divert her sustenance from the Church of England and apply it to purposes of 'public utility,' such

as board-schools, technical institutes, or recreation grounds. These things are excellent in their way; we desire that they may increase and flourish. But we utterly deny that it would be for the advantage of the people, and especially of the poor, that the property which is consecrated to the spiritual needs of the nation should be wrested from it to be applied to secular purposes; and if such a measure were carried, its disastrous effects would be felt in every cottage in the realm. To the rich and the upper classes such a change might be a matter of comparative indifference. They would still retain their churches and the clergy of their choice. But to the poor the loss of the parochial ministrations of the clergy would be irreparable. Mr. Gladstone's attachment to the Church of England is well known, and he expressed it in a speech delivered on May 16, 1873, in terms even more emphatic than we have thought it right to use.

'The Church of England has not only been a part of the history of this country, but a part so vital, entering so profoundly into the entire life and action of the country, that the severing of the two would leave nothing behind but a bleeding and lacerated mass. Take the Church of England out of the history of England, and the history of England becomes a chaos without order, without life, and without meaning.'

We will only add that the precedent of the disestablishment of the Irish Church is not to the point, and is not encouraging. It is not to the point, because in Ireland, unhappily, the Anglican Church was not the Church of the people, but was regarded as alien and heretical; it is not encouraging, because the large fund arising from the Irish Church revenues has been dissipated by scandalous misapplications to political purposes, whereas it ought, on every principle of justice and policy, to have been applied to the spiritual wants of the Irish people, in the form of Christianity to which they belong.

3. The third proposition of the Westminster Borough Committee is 'Home Rule for England, Wales, Scotland, 'and Ireland'—in other words, the disintegration of the United Kingdom, and the establishment of local councils in the several parts of it. It is scarcely worth while to discuss seriously such a measure, although it has received encouragement from a platform speaker who was lately a Cabinet Minister. This would be to substitute in these small islands a federal government for a united monarchy, and to annihilate the imperial power which makes the Queen and Parliament of the United Kingdom the heads of an Empire. It is the concentration of power, not its subdivision, which is the first condition of national greatness and ministerial

responsibility. One of the characteristics of the British Constitution is, that every incident in our social life may be, and is (sometimes to excess), brought under the fierce light of the House of Commons, and that no local interest is so small as not to find an audience and an answer there. If local interests were circumscribed within local assemblies, they would evade the control of universal publicity, and would fall under the grasp of hole-and-corner politicians instead of statesmen. Whoever has had any experience of local elective bodies or committees must be aware that the members of them are much more eager to serve their own peculiar or personal interests than to consider the general effect of their measures on the interests of the public. The smaller such bodies are, the more apt are they to become selfish and corrupt. But even such a body as the London School Board has forgotten, in its zeal for the education of the people, that they are laying an excessive burden on the ratepayers, such indeed as no Parliamentary Minister would have ventured to propose.*

The question of local government is undoubtedly one of

* We cannot enter into details, but the evidence taken by the Select Committee of the House of Lords on the Poor Law Guardians (Irish) Bill affords indisputable evidence of the working of local self-government in Ireland. One of Mr. Parnell's declared objects is to expel the *ex-officio* guardians from the Poor Law Boards, and to make them wholly elective. In other words, they would be appointed by the class of persons who are in a position to claim charitable relief, and the so-called 'guardians' would refuse it at their peril. The Irish Poor Law was always regarded as a hazardous experiment; but a Poor Law worked by the nominees of the poor would effectually pauperise the country. And the facts correspond to this prevision. Thus at Listowel, which is ruled by elective guardians, whereas in 1880 outdoor relief was given to 285 persons at a cost of 65*l.*, in 1884 outdoor relief was given to 2,187 persons at a cost of 1,638*l.* In Tralee 87 persons received relief in 1877 at a cost of 31*l.*; in 1884 3,434 persons received relief at a cost of 2,534*l.* Wherever the *ex-officio* guardians have failed to control the expenditure (sometimes at the peril of their lives), similar results have ensued. The Poor Law has been used for political purposes to compel men to join the 'National League,' by granting relief to the members of that body and by refusing it to those who stood aloof from it. The increase in the rates is used as a means of attacking and punishing the landed interest. Local government in Ireland by boards elected by a very extended suffrage, and uncontrolled by the Government or the tax-paying classes, would become a means of plunder, amounting to communism; and the evil done to the recipients of this plunder would be morally greater than the actual loss to the victims of this system of robbery and corruption.

those which most urgently require to be dealt with by enlightened reformers and statesmen. But the conspicuous abuse and evil of English local government is not that it does not exist, but that it is most irrationally subdivided and diffused. What is wanted is not more division, but more concentration. Local authority is broken up into an incredible number of fragments, the creation of accident, governed by no unity of principle or design—county magistrates, poor-law unions, parishes, boroughs with charters, boroughs without charters, vestries, school boards, paving and lighting commissioners, harbour commissioners, &c. &c., all exercising a certain amount of power within limits ill defined, and often overlapping and conflicting with each other. The object of a Local Government Bill should be to reduce these various elements to a certain degree of unity of system, which can only be done by the creation of a local power, elected by the people, sufficiently large to absorb or control these minor divisions, but not such as to assume a political character and encroach upon the functions of the State. The more party politics can be eliminated from such authorities the better, for their duties are not political but social. Our quarter sessions, our poor-law boards, and school boards are singularly free from political colour. In France every village or town has its municipal council and its chief magistrate; and another council governs the affairs of the Department. The structure bears the stamp of that love of symmetry which characterises the French administration. Probably one of the reasons which have most powerfully contributed to reconcile the population of France to republican institutions is, that the Republic has very wisely conceded to these local bodies more freedom of action than they had under the Monarchy and the Empire, although they are still too much under the control of the Government, which claims the right to sanction every item of their expenditure, even to the smallest particulars. English habits and the old traditions of local government demand a far more liberal treatment by the State; but it is not the less true that it is unsafe to entrust powers of taxation, or powers of borrowing money, to local bodies, without some parliamentary control. The power of taxation is the limit of authority; the right to spend and apply the money of the people is in an exact ratio to the power of levying it. National assemblies for England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland, would be mere mock parliaments, unless the power of taxation were vested in them, which is impos-

sible, because it would be inconsistent with the existence of the realm and the due control of the national expenditure. For what are local interests? Nothing is more difficult than to define them. Mr. Parnell says that the local interests of Ireland include the reduction of the rent of land to prairie value, and the protection of Irish manufactures by import duties. In all confederate states, such as the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, it has been found impossible to determine beforehand by law what rights fall within the control of the Union and what belong to the provincial legislatures. A perpetual contest is going on between them; and no sooner are local councils or boards created, armed with considerable powers, than they seek to extend them by resisting the authority of the Executive Government and of the Supreme Legislature itself. Home Rule would reduce the constitution of Great Britain to that of the United Provinces.

4. On the fourth point of the Westminster Committee we are at one with them. The imposition of oaths to bind the conscience of men to the performance of civil or political duties, which they are otherwise required to perform to the best of their ability on pain of dismissal, appears to us to be untenable. To deal lightly with an oath, or to impose it on a reluctant conscience, is to prostitute its sacred character, and for all political purposes a solemn declaration is of equal value to a man of honour. To a man without honour neither oath nor declaration is of any avail. History is strewn with broken political oaths, none of which have ever restrained men from the course of action they may think fit to pursue. But this argument does not apply to oaths required by courts of justice; there the lives and property of men depend on the strict veracity of witnesses, which should be enforced by the most solemn obligation, and a breach of that obligation justly renders the offender liable to the penalty of perjury for taking the name of God in vain, and for bearing false witness against his neighbour.

5. It is of sinister import that whilst the advanced Radical party seek to extend the power of election to its widest limits, they also seek to narrow the area of taxation; so that the classes which claim a larger share in the public expenditure become more numerous and powerful, whilst the classes from whom the revenue is levied by direct taxation are a comparatively feeble minority. A graduated income-tax, by which the possessors of property should pay not only in proportion to their means, but in an increasing ratio, is the

very acme of inequality and injustice. The objections to a property and income tax are, that it is paid by a small fraction of the population, that an equal or nearly equal charge is borne by those who pay it under unequal conditions, and that it may be increased with fatal facility at the pleasure of those who do not pay it. It cannot be adjusted so as to operate with entire equality and justice; and it is an evil that in our financial system direct taxation has superseded indirect taxation to so large an extent; for indirect taxes have this peculiarity, that whilst they exist they are paid as it were unconsciously, by the act of the consumers, but when they are abolished it is extremely difficult to reimpose them.

To some extent the income-tax is by its nature a graduated tax, for it affects only those who enjoy an income above a certain amount. The lower classes of incomes are taxed at an easier rate or altogether exempted. But to increase this inequality by applying a higher rate of taxation to larger incomes would be alike unjust and impolitic, and would defeat its own object. 'All taxes,' says Adam Smith, 'so far as they diminish the capital value of property, tend to diminish the funds destined for the maintenance of 'productive labour.'

All these schemes for relieving the majority from taxation at the expense of the minority have something of a communistic character, and are directed against the security of property and the application of 'the funds destined for the 'maintenance of productive labour.'* They start from the fallacy that one man is the poorer because another man is

* It is difficult to ascertain correctly the number of persons who pay the income-tax, because the tax on landed property and the rent of houses is deducted from the rent, and the tax on funded property and public companies is subtracted from the dividends. The total number of contributors in England and Wales under Schedule D (trades and professions) is 428,007; but of these 202,049 pay on incomes under 200*l.* at reduced rates. The incomes below 1,000*l.* a year are in number 205,067, amounting in all to 1,085,333*l.* The incomes above 1,000*l.* a year are in number 22,891, with a total amount of 1,623,191*l.*

The number of contributors under Schedule E is 579,097; but most persons are rated under more than one schedule. Schedules D and E include more than half the net amount of income subject to the tax. Probably the total number of persons paying income-tax in England and Wales does not much exceed 500,000, and of those not more than one-tenth exceed 1,000*l.* a year. So that a graduated income-tax on the wealthier class would be levied on a very small fraction of the population.

rich. But that is not only not true, but the reverse of the truth. The wealth of the capitalist is the wages fund which enables the workman to live by his productive labour. It travels through a thousand channels into the whole frame of society, as the blood travels through the arteries and veins of the human body and returns to the heart. Whatever checks that circulation is disease. If that circulation ceases, it is death.

It is part of the Radical programme that the growth of capital should be directly limited by the State. Mr. Chamberlain says expressly,

‘When your property has grown to a magnitude that exceeds what, *in the opinion of the State*, is compatible with the public interest should be possessed by the individual, it will peremptorily discourage you from going farther. There is one way in which the State can execute such a revolution. It can provide for a graduated probate duty upon landed proprietors above a certain size.’ (P. 57.)

And if on land why not on personal property too? Do the authors of the Radical programme suppose that such a measure would attract capital to this country or send it elsewhere?

6. Upon no question of the day does such an astonishing amount of ignorance and delusion prevail as on what is called the ‘thorough reform of the land laws;’ chiefly, we presume, because those who talk on this subject have no connexion with, or experience of, landed property, and have not even made themselves acquainted with the laws that govern it. No class is more interested in the reform and improvement of the laws and procedure relating to land than that of the land owners and land occupiers themselves. They have every reason to desire the simplification of transfers of land, the enfranchisement of copyholds and subtenures, and the relief of various encumbrances. The only simple and effectual mode of accomplishing this object is by a general registration of titles and mortgages, based on a cadastral survey, which to a great extent already exists in the maps of the Ordnance Department. Such a measure is highly desirable, and would be accomplished by the bills drawn by Mr. Horace Davey. So far we are entirely in favour of progressive reform, and very large steps have been taken in that direction. There are now, in fact, no settlements of land which cannot be transferred into another form of property. Under Lord Cairns’s Act a tenant for life has an all but unlimited power of sale. The law of primogeniture, of which much is made, operates solely in cases of intestacy, in the rare cases where the descent of pro-

perty is determined by no will or settlement. At the present time the conditions of the tenure of land are materially changed by natural causes, and the value of land is falling. All that is needed is the utmost freedom of contract to enable the relations of rural society to adjust themselves to these altered circumstances, and we believe that any intervention of the legislature to adjust and control the free course of the market would simply be pernicious. It is by freedom, and not by the nostrums of political partisans or the intervention of the State, that the problem, such as it is, will be solved. Thus experience has shown that very large farms are not the most favourable to the agricultural interest; and that it is for the benefit both of landlord and tenant rather to divide them into holdings of from 50 to 300 acres than to unite them. The parties concerned may safely be left to discover what is for their mutual advantage, and to adjust their arrangements to it. But the division of farms does not imply the division of estates, still less does it extend to the minute subdivision of land into peasant properties, which we believe it to be impossible to farm profitably in this country.

We are told by some of these gentlemen that their object is 'to break up the large landed estates.' From a political point of view, that means that they desire to break up the owners of those estates and their families, because they regard them as political opponents. But we shall here consider the proposal merely on economical and social grounds. Can it be doubted, can it be denied, that the large estates of this country are at least as well managed as any other enterprise in it? There are to be found the largest amount of capital, the greatest skill, the most commodious buildings, the best machinery, the newest experiments and improvements, most stock, in short, the most judicious application of labour to the production of the food of the people in corn, roots, and meat. A large estate is a large manufactory of food. If it is expedient to 'break it up,' why not apply the same treatment to every establishment in which capital and labour are combined on a large scale—cotton-mills, collieries, building yards, and even public companies, which are great employers of labour? That would be the ruin of the country: is it to be the salvation of agriculture? The subdivision of land would have two results: the operations of agriculture would be carried on less effectually, and the sum of the returns of agriculture to the wealth of the country would decrease.

If the agricultural labourer, whose earnings have doubled in many parts of the country in the last sixty years, is ever induced to exchange his weekly wages duly paid for the uncertain returns of ten acres of freehold land cultivated by himself, he will find that he has been cruelly misled by one of the popular fallacies of the day. If the food, the clothing, the cottages, and the general condition of the rural population of England and their hours of labour* be compared with those of their own grandfathers, or with those of the rural population of any part of continental Europe, it will be found that the existing system of the cultivation of land has placed British labourers at the top of their class in life; and we trust they may never fall below it, but will continue to advance in intelligence, well-being, and culture.

For those who prefer plain truths to popular fallacies few books can be at the present time more interesting and useful than Lady Verney's 'Essays on Peasant Properties,' which we have placed, for that reason, at the head of this article. They are the result of the personal observation of an acute, intelligent, and benevolent observer, well acquainted with the real conditions of rural life in England, as well as in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and Austria. They are not written with any political purpose; but they are an honest and successful attempt to *get at the truth* on a much debated question of social economy. We will add that our own personal experience exactly corroborates Lady Verney's observations, and that no other book, except perhaps Mr. Hamerton's 'Around my House,' gives in English so true and vivid a picture of the present condition of the French and German peasantry. The result is that the peasant proprietor is visibly descending in the scale of living, with increased labour, increased debt, diminished food, and diminishing property; and the moral and domestic consequences of the excessive subdivision of the land among small owners are not more beneficial than their physical effects. Lady Verney sets the whole case before us. We can only afford space for a brief summary of her remarks:—

* One of the proposals put forward by Radical candidates is the limitation of the hours of labour by law to eight hours a day. That would simply be to curtail by about one fifth the productive power and wealth of the country, and must be fatal to us in competition with the labouring classes abroad, who work for many more hours and at lower wages.

‘We inquired narrowly into the condition of the small proprietors again on our road home, and came to the conclusion that the day labourer and his family in England are better fed, better clothed, better housed; that the man has more time to himself; and the whole household is more civilised than these little owners of the soil. Compared to the men “north of Trent,” the comparison is enormously to the advantage of England, but we would take even our southern counties, and still contend that the scale is higher on this side the Channel. Existence is only possible, on such mere scraps of land as we saw in Belgium and Germany, by the protracted and incessant labour of the whole family, without intermission. The man occasionally has a surcease by hiring out his labour; but the home life of the women and children is one of slavery and squalid misery, such as is not known with us. They submit also to a scale of diet unwholesomely low, and which I am thankful to say our people would refuse to endure.

‘But it is said the possession of land has an ennobling effect. Is it so? Is it a high ideal to be the owner of what entails a degrading drudgery on the wife, old at forty from overwork, and the bad health, from neglect, of many of the children? an ownership dependent on the good pleasure of the money-lender, who may foreclose when a more than usually bad season prevents the payment of the always high interest? As one of our German authorities informed us, How can the peasant proprietor be out of debt? The expenses of cultivation are as great—or greater—in a bad year than they are in a good one, on a small farm as on a large one; but in a bad season, when the corn, the fruit, or the vines fail, the small man has nothing to fall back upon for his daily bread; the large one has some resources husbanded. The English labourer, paying a fixed yearly rent for the allotments which are now to be found all over England—*not able to mortgage*, with a weekly wage—the two and in some counties four “harvests,” as they are locally called—the “extras” which are so valuable—the help from the farmer of his team to fetch coal, &c.—the clothing, shoe, and fuel clubs—is better off materially and morally than such merely nominal owners. In Germany the discontent among the peasants is often great, and emigration takes place to a very great extent and seems to be increasing. There is an enquiry going on at this time as to their condition. In Prussia 82 per cent. are exempt from direct taxation by reason of poverty, 7,000,000 heads of families earning less than 25*l.* in the year—9*s.* 7*d.* per week. Few, indeed, who have studied the condition of the small proprietors on the land, and not in books, but will feel that the introduction of such a system would be a fall, not a rise, for the labourer in England. There is much to be done to ameliorate his position, but it will hardly lie in this direction, here, where the value of land to buy is still high and that of its hire is diminishing. In all other occupations, moreover, the small man is going to the wall; the hand-loom weaver at Coventry and Spitalfields cannot hold his own; the stocking-machines of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire have all been driven out by the large manufactories; the small kingdoms in Germany and Italy have followed the fate of the Heptarchy. It will be exceedingly paradoxical if in agriculture alone it should be found that

the peasant proprietor, with his wretched instruments, his want of manure, his unskilled labour, can do better for the land than men of capital and intelligence with the command of machinery. "The average yield of wheat in France is rather less than half the amount in England," says Mr. Caird. As to the good effect which the possession of land can give, this is better obtained by the allotments or small pasture farms (arable cannot be made to pay) nearer to the labourer's cottage than the holdings abroad, which are sometimes miles away from the Bauer's dwelling, yet not so large as to induce him to depend upon its produce for his living, as do the wretched families of whom we saw so many.'

The French Revolution, that eternal lesson to those who will read its results aright, has carried the radical reform of the land laws to the full extent that the Westminster Committee would claim, and even beyond it, for the Civil Code deprives men of the power of disposing of their property after death, and establishes a system of compulsory partition both of land and goods. The property of the Church was confiscated and sold for assignats; a vast quantity of land was thrown on the market and subdivided, but the selling price of it is now diminishing. One-third of the land of France is still in the hands of large landowners, one-third in small farms, and one-third divided into minute parcels, not even contiguous to each other. What is the result? The existence of the peasant proprietor is to the last degree severe and laborious. He toils from dawn till sunset. The growth of population is checked by the dread of subdivision, for the instinct of property is stronger than even the instinct of life. The condition of women is notably lowered by field labour, which compels them to neglect their domestic duties. The improvement of agriculture is slow, and the productive power of a fine soil and climate remains below that of less favoured countries. The land is mortgaged to excess on usurious terms. The non-proprietary population flock to the towns, and the agricultural distress, now felt more or less throughout the world, is absolute ruin to the small farmer without capital, and with no external resources to assist him in his hour of need. We doubt whether many English farm labourers, as long as they are assured of regular wages, would exchange their lot for that of a French peasant if they knew the facts of the case. But what we most desire is that, in the exercise of the share of political power now conferred upon them, the rural population should be guided by *truths*, and not by false and inflammatory statements—shadows in place of substance—which would prove in the end injurious to their real interests and welfare. Whatever

may be the effect of the existing legislation with reference to land on those whose property is vested in it, we affirm that it is by no means injurious or unfavourable to the labouring classes, who necessarily form the bulk of the population, and we entirely admit that whatever tends to improve the condition of those classes is and ought to be one of the first objects of legislation and of government.

The schemes for the artificial creation of peasant proprietors by advances of public money, all rest on two propositions which are equally mischievous—the intervention of the State in private industry, and the promotion of private industry at the expense of the Treasury or the rates—that is, of the taxpayers. But why are peasant proprietors to enjoy the privilege of being set up in business at the cost of the public? Has not every avocation in life as good a claim? Why not advance to the tradesman the capital for his fittings and his stock? To the fisherman for his boat and his nets? To the builder or the carpenter for his materials and his tools? To every man, in short, what he requires? ‘*À chacun,*’ M. Louis Blanc said, ‘*selon ses besoins.*’ It is a system of universal pauperism, the end of which is ruin. One of the first effects of such advances to the peasant farmers would be the encouragement of early marriages, and a stimulus to a pauper population. For where would the peasant proprietor of ten acres of land find himself at the end of the next generation, when the land must either be minutely subdivided as in France, or the younger children of the family left to live by their wits? Such follies as these scarcely require to be exposed.

7. The reform of the Corporation of the City of London and the Livery Companies is a matter of local interest, and on the latter part of this question we have recently expressed our opinion at some length. Undoubtedly the establishment of an effective municipal government for the whole metropolis is a most desirable and necessary object. The confusion and conflict of boards, vestries, and parishes in London illustrates what we said just now on the subject of local government. What is required is the concentration of authority in metropolitan affairs in the hands of a competent and responsible municipal executive. But it may be doubted whether that result would be obtained by the creation of an elective assembly consisting of two or three hundred members, which would inevitably become a mock Parliament, more given to debate than to action, and which might under certain circumstances seek to exchange its municipal func-

tions for political power. The principle of subdivision which has been wisely adopted as the basis of the redistribution of seats in the vast metropolitan constituency, might also be applied to municipal reform. Each of the Parliamentary divisions of the metropolis might elect one or two members of an executive council, which would be quite numerous enough for the transaction of business, and would introduce into the municipal body representatives of every part of the metropolis.

8. We must class amongst dangerous popular fallacies the contention that the endowments for the education of the poor have been wrested from them by the Charity Commissioners, and the proposal that elementary education should be free and non-sectarian—that is, that the entire elementary education of the people should be secular and the expense borne by the taxpayers of the kingdom. We are not prepared to defend all the schemes of the Charity Commissioners which have been approved by the Government. In some cases respectable local interests have suffered, and the desire to raise the character of endowed schools to a higher level has been carried to excess. The children of a village suffer by the transfer of an endowment, however humble, to a neighbouring town. But upon the whole the Charity Commissioners have undoubtedly succeeded in correcting the misapplication of endowments, they have enlarged and raised the character of schools, and they have made them not less but more popular and useful. It is a gross misrepresentation to accuse them of indifference to popular interests.

The proposal to make elementary education free and non-sectarian raises very different questions. It means that the whole expense of elementary education must be thrown on the taxpaying classes, chiefly for the benefit of the poor, and that the entire voluntary system of denominational schools should be exposed to the competition of free schools supported by the State. In other words, the public funds are to be employed to destroy one of the most laudable institutions of our social economy, supported as it is partly by private munificence and partly by the contributions of the children educated by it. One class, and that the less numerous, is to supply the wants of the more numerous body. The arguments against such a measure are many, but in our eyes the most serious one is that this is a form of pauperism. It is to throw upon the State a charge which the great bulk of the working classes

in England are able to bear themselves, and which it is their duty to bear, without eleemosynary relief. The word 'free' is now not uncommonly used to denote that the thing one person wants another person is to pay for, or that it is to be taken by legislative enactment out of the pocket of its former owner.

It is worth while to compare and bring clearly before the eyes of the public the relative number and cost of the schools supported chiefly by voluntary contributions, and the schools wholly supported by taxation in the form of school rates or state grants. They are as follows:—

Number of Voluntary Schools in 1884	.	.	.	14,580
Average attendance	.	.	.	2,157,292
Average cost per scholar	.	.	.	1 <i>l.</i> 15 <i>s.</i> 2 <i>d.</i>
which is defrayed by				
School pence	.	.	.	11 <i>s.</i> 2 <i>d.</i>
Subscriptions	.	.	.	6 <i>s.</i> 8½ <i>d.</i>
Government grant	.	.	.	16 <i>s.</i> 4½ <i>d.</i>
Of these Voluntary schools				
There are Church schools	.	.	.	11,808
Wesleyan	.	.	.	558
Roman Catholic	.	.	.	828
British schools, Jews, &c.	.	.	.	1,497
Number of Board Schools in 1884	.	.	.	4,183
Average attendance	.	.	.	1,115,852
Average cost per scholar	.	.	.	2 <i>l.</i> 1 <i>s.</i> 8¾ <i>d.</i>
which is defrayed by				
Rates	.	.	.	16 <i>s.</i> 8 <i>d.</i>
Government grant	.	.	.	17 <i>s.</i> 11 <i>d.</i>
School pence	.	.	.	9 <i>s.</i> 5¾ <i>d.</i>

'The great majority of voluntary schools with seats for 1,177,834, have been erected or enlarged without Government aid, at a cost to the promoters of at least 5,000,000*l.*

'The School Boards have availed themselves freely of the power of borrowing on the security of the rates. Up to April 1, 1885, 6,160 loans had been sanctioned by the Education Department, amounting to 17,355,954*l.* 19*s.* 3*d.*, to 1,740 school boards.' (*Report of 1885.*)

These figures demonstrate that the voluntary schools are more than threefold the board schools in number, and teach about twice as many scholars. The board schools are the most expensive, and have burdened the ratepayers with an enormous debt.

If elementary education, free and unsectarian, were established by law, the voluntary schools would cease in great measure to exist, for they cannot be maintained without

the school pence. The cost of board schools would be increased by one-fourth by the loss of the school pence, and about half the cost of the 14,550 voluntary schools (if they existed at all) would be thrown upon the rates in addition to the present Government grant. The Government grant (independent of rates) amounts at present to about 2,700,000*l.* This expenditure of public money would be at least tripled, and the charge on the revenue for elementary education would amount to between eight and nine millions sterling per annum.

9. Sir Wilfrid Lawson conceives that the demand for what is called 'Local Option' will exercise a considerable influence over the approaching election. The question is social rather than political, and may be advocated, without inconsistency, by candidates of either party. With the utmost desire to promote the cause of sobriety and temperance, which affects both the health and the pockets of the working classes, we trust rather to the progress of self-restraint by individual conviction or voluntary association than to Acts of Parliament or the control of local authorities. It is a manifest encroachment on personal liberty to establish police regulations affecting the habits of daily life, which have no criminal character; it is unjust to shut up the poor man's alehouse, while you leave untouched the rich man's cellar; and these regulations are, as we understand it, to be imposed by a majority of votes on a non-consenting minority—another instance of the strange popular desire to enforce uniformity by law. Peter the Great made his Russian subjects cut off their beards; what would be said of an autocrat who should by decree shut up all the public houses in his dominions?

10. From this minor point the Westminster Committee plunges into the wider field of imperial politics. 'No further extension of the Empire by war or otherwise'—most undoubtedly it has been the policy and the desire of every administration for the last seventy years to avoid war and not to extend the Empire. No ministers ever held those objects in view more emphatically than Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues. Yet they were engaged in continual warfare, and they were compelled by the outcry of the Australian colonies to add a great part of one of the largest islands in the world to the Empire, not to mention Bechuana land, of the limits of which we have no clear idea. The current of events, and sometimes the current of public opinion, is too strong to be effectually resisted; and it sometimes happens that, in the attempt to evade responsibility and increased

dominion, a statesman is constrained reluctantly to submit to the very obligations he is most anxious to avoid. Our foreign relations are determined not only by our own choice, but by the attitude and conduct of foreign Powers; and although the policy of England is essentially pacific, she cannot forget that she has an empire to defend and maintain. The danger of war and imperial extension arises at the present time far more from the exciteability and the demands of democratic communities than from the ambition of statesmen and soldiers.

11. We may pass lightly over the concluding terms of the Westminster programme. Triennial Parliaments are an old article of the People's Charter, but men who have just come from the electoral battle-field are not anxious to abridge their own little lease of power. On an average the duration of Parliaments does not exceed four years. Certainly, after five years the House of Commons is apt to lose touch (as the phrase goes) with the country.

'Royal dowries and pensions' are always odious in the eyes of the least informed classes of the people, who know nothing of the bargain between the Crown and the nation, by which the nation is a large gainer. The existing arrangements are alike disagreeable to the Royal Family and to Parliament, but they are inevitable at present; and it must be said that it is highly creditable to the illustrious persons concerned, that during the whole of the long reign of Queen Victoria, no application has ever been made to Parliament for the payment of debts, as was more than once the case in preceding reigns, and this although the income derived from the State by the Prince of Wales and his family is notoriously inadequate to the peculiar position in which he stands.

The abolition of the game laws is another favourite hustings topic, and we agree that property in game should be assimilated to every other kind of property. But to destroy property in game is simply to destroy game itself. We understand that the effect of Sir William Harcourt's celebrated Hares and Rabbits Bill has been that these animals are now preserved in greater number than ever, because the tenant farmer finds it his interest to do so. Sporting rights are regulated by custom and agreement, and of course considered in rent. These, like other matters, should be determined by free contract.

Our list winds up with a singular proposal for the 'taxation of ground landlords.' Why this description of property should be singled out for especial taxation we do not under-

stand. Ground landlords pay income-tax on their ground-rents, and can hardly be made liable to pay more. A man who has covered his land with houses has just as much right to his property as another man who has planted a forest, or opened a coalmine, or even laid it down in grass. All the schemes of this nature start from the assumption that individual rights, and especially those touching landed property, are more or less at the mercy of the State, and that State interference may overbear and overturn all that the law holds sacred, for in fact the administration of justice only exists for the purpose of protecting what these innovators are seeking to destroy. These are the acts and measures of arbitrary power, and the whole social condition of Englishmen must be changed before they submit to surrender that personal liberty and those personal rights which have hitherto been their most precious inheritance.

Radical orators and Westminster committees cannot boast of a monopoly of extravagant pretensions and popular fallacies; the Tories are not behindhand in their attempt to mislead the people; and the term Radical becomes additionally significant when the word Tory is prefixed to it, for these are the men who would sacrifice their most cherished engagements to win a popular vote. Their favourite delusion is what they call 'Fair Trade'—a specious name for the old hag Protection. We have before us a leaflet circulated by a candidate for a southern county who vows he would not for the world lay a shilling on the food of the people; on the contrary, he would sweep away the duties on tea, tobacco, coffee, and cocoa, and supply the deficiency of twelve or fourteen millions by duties on foreign manufactured goods! Is this wiseacre aware that the foreign manufactured goods imported into England do not exceed one-twentieth part of our imports, the other nineteen-twentieths consisting of raw material or food? And does he not perceive that if heavy duties were imposed on foreign manufactured goods, so as to transfer the manufacture to English workmen, such duties would extinguish the trade, and produce no revenue at all? This is a degree of ignorance or of dishonesty which hardly qualifies a man for a seat in the House of Commons. The Tories would do more good to the country and to their party by adopting one of the principles which has slipped altogether out of the Radical programme, though not out of the Liberal creed. We mean the old cry of 'retrenchment' and economy.' Not a vestige of it remains. Almost all the changes proposed by the democratic leaders involve

enormously increased expenditure by the State—free schools, advances of public money in many shapes, inspectors of every kind, ecclesiastical disestablishment, &c.—and the politicians of the Birmingham school make it their boast that they spend and borrow as much as they can for the people. Another absurd fallacy! What is spent for the people, comes out of the pocket of the people, and they are amused and flattered at their own expense. The vast increase in the expenditure, taxes, and rates of this country in the last twenty-five years is mainly due to the increasing demands of the democracy on the public purse. The people forget that it is their own life-blood which they shed so freely.

We have reviewed at some length the various proposals of the Radical party, because it is of interest to ascertain the grounds on which they claim the votes of the more advanced section of the Liberal electorate. But in reality these are mere electoral *réclames*, for the most part unsubstantial and delusive fallacies—cobwebs to catch flies—which will not support the ordeal of Parliamentary debate, although they may serve a purpose on the platform and the hustings. It is desirable that the opinions of candidates on the more important of these matters should be clearly ascertained. But, if we are not mistaken, the great practical question which will, like the rod of Aaron, devour all minor topics of controversy in the ensuing session of the new Parliament, will be one of a much more vital character, and this will be the case whichever party may happen to obtain the majority and to hold the reins of executive power. Mr. Parnell has declared in explicit language that henceforth the Irish Nationalist party, reinforced by the large additions which he anticipates from the extended electorate of Ireland, will concentrate its strength upon a single object—or, as he terms it, a single plank—and that, disdaining all subsidiary measures, it will demand with all the power at its command the one object of legislative independence, or, in other words, the Repeal of the Union and the disintegration of the United Kingdom. It is highly desirable that this issue should be forthwith and plainly tried on its merits, and that the Irish party should take the field and assert its real purpose, instead of harassing or upsetting ministries and obstructing legislation by intrigues and ambushes. The first question, therefore, to be put to a British candidate, of whatever colour, is, ‘Will you or will you not support in its integrity ‘the Union of the three kingdoms?’ Upon that point there can be no obscurity and no evasion.

Mr. Parnell's declaration has fortunately swept away the whole tissue of artifices and expedients by which attempts have been made to mask the real question which is at stake. Experience has demonstrated that none of the measures of conciliation, from Catholic emancipation downwards—the Land Act, the Disestablishment of the Church in Ireland, the Arrears Act, &c.—measures, most of which were just and laudable in themselves, although others were indefensible on the grounds of political economy and public morality—have accomplished the object fondly anticipated by their authors and promoters. We are assured with great plainness and by indisputable authority that none of them could have that or any such effect. They were only sullenly accepted by the leaders of the Irish people as stepping-stones to the great deliverance which is to make them the sovereigns of the country. The proposal to concede to the Irish party the greatest possible amount of local government, by the creation of elective county boards, would only place additional power in their hands, without in the least satisfying their ulterior demands. The opinion of a most enlightened Liberal authority in Ireland is that the reconstitution of local government in that country by purely elective boards would at the present time be productive of evil. 'It would revive 'and perpetuate,' we are told, 'the power of a disloyal faction 'which demands separation, without satisfying the Irish 'people, because it would subject them to increased local 'taxation and would not gratify their religious and political 'passions, which aim at the humiliation of England.'

What then is meant by legislative independence, and what would be the character of an Irish Parliament? It is demonstrated by actual experience that it would not be a free Parliament at all, representing the various interests and opinions of the people. Mr. Parnell deals with the existing extended electorate of Ireland precisely as the Emperor Napoleon III. dealt with the mock assembly of the representatives of France. His method is Cæsarian. He and his friends are to select the candidates—no one is to have the votes of the people who has not their permission and approval—and these candidates are to sign a pledge that they will resign their seats if they fail to yield implicit obedience to the leaders of the party. This is simply to make Mr. Parnell the Grand Elector of Ireland, and to annihilate the very institution which he professes to confer on his countrymen. For it is evident that the first Irish Parliament would be elected under the same influences, and

that the effect would be the creation, not of a free constitution, but of an absolute dictatorship. To name the representatives whom the people are to elect is the perfection of democratic autocracy. That is the system by which M. Gambetta hoped to be master of France. That is the system favoured by Mr. Chamberlain and the Birmingham Caucus. And by the same means Mr. Parnell expects to bring not only the Irish people but the British Parliament to his feet. It is for the electors of Great Britain to say whether they will submit to such pretensions as these. Fortunately the integrity of the United Kingdom is no question of party politics at all. It ought to be upheld by the combined strength of all men who are loyal to the Crown and to the Empire, and the demands of Mr. Parnell should be met, as the demands of O'Connell were met in 1834, by an absolute and peremptory denial.

An Irish Parliament at the present time would present no resemblance to the Irish Parliament of 1782. That was an exclusively Protestant Parliament, and the fact that it represented a minority of the people attached it more closely to the British connexion. An Irish Parliament would now be essentially Roman Catholic, being returned under the influence of the priests and the demagogues. That circumstance alone would inflame its hatred of a Protestant dominion, and let loose all the fury of intolerance and religious animosity, which still exists in Ireland to a greater degree than in any part of the civilised world. It may easily be foreseen that such contests would not be settled within the walls of Parliament, and that the bold and brave Irishmen of the north would not submit to be ruled by another synod of Kilkenny.

There cannot be any such thing as 'legislative independence' without the existence of an independent executive government. The Ministers of England could no longer be the Ministers of Ireland, with a double Parliamentary responsibility and conflicting obligations. It is a common complaint of the Irish that they are ruled by an alien government. We presume that the Queen is not an alien in her own dominions, and that her representative and his Chief Secretary, be they who they may, share in that respect the royal prerogative; below that supreme rank, the whole administrative and judicial establishment of Ireland is as Irish as any of Mr. Parnell's followers. There are no aliens even at Dublin Castle, and if there be here and there a Saxon employé, it would be easy to produce a far greater number of Irishmen in British offices of every rank.

Mr. Parnell would seem to offer an exceedingly bad bargain to his followers. In exchange for the entire self-government of Ireland by himself and his nominees, he proposes to renounce the representation of the Irish people in the British Parliament, and consequently all influence over the chief affairs of the Empire. The Irish Parliament would have about the same importance as the Assemblies of Canada or New South Wales, which neither contribute anything to the revenue of the United Kingdom nor receive anything from it. He asks for the power of taxation, but he must renounce all claims whatsoever on the British Treasury. The whole Irish establishment and government must of course be supported exclusively by the resources of Ireland. The army and police would be withdrawn, and, as there is no Irish navy, the coasts of the island would be absolutely defenceless. The emancipated Irish would become what the citizens of the United States now are, aliens in Great Britain, and therefore ineligible for public employments and incapable of exercising any political rights. The position of those who might remain on this side St. George's Channel would resemble that of the Chinese in California. As far as English and Scotch interests are concerned, we have never accepted the opinion that the repeal of the Union would be a disastrous calamity to Great Britain, nor do we suppose that any other State would seek to invade and acquire such a possession. But the ruin of Ireland would be complete. The country would pass through a revolution, ending in civil war, and the wretched agitators who have kindled this conflagration for their own sinister purposes would perish one after the other in the convulsion. Such a result would undoubtedly be dishonourable and disgraceful to this country, and would in fact not be endured.

We see no reason to change one iota of the language we used five years ago in describing the great conspiracy which was then already at work to accomplish its treasonable purposes—for if there be any sense in the word 'treason' it must mean the deliberate attempt to undermine and overthrow a State. Then was the time, in our judgement, to meet the revival of the Repeal movement with firmness and resolution, by such measures as were necessary to declare the Queen's Government to be supreme in the country. Instead of that, two Governments have continued to exist in open conflict. The Government of the Crown has made concession after concession, being the weaker of the two; and Mr. Parnell boasts, and is entitled to boast, of the in-

credible amount of concessions he has wrung in the last five years from the British House of Commons. This success has only strengthened his confidence and his purpose. It is a contemptible delusion, which is spurned by Mr. Parnell himself, to suppose that further concessions in the shape of local boards or land purchase acts will satisfy him or buy off any portion of his followers. Mr. Parnell is so much the master of his own party that he can instantly inflict political extinction on any man who should recede from the advanced position he has himself taken up. His adherents are bound to him by the double tie of hope and fear. They look to him for the very means of subsistence. Even now, if we may believe the forecasts of those who are watching the course of this formidable movement on the spot, it appears to many that a crisis is drawing near; and it is not improbable that the first duty of the Imperial Parliament will be to meet it. The affairs of this Empire have for many years run in so even a course, seldom raising controversies more important than the fate of a ministry or the removal of a tax, that we are apt to forget that the game of politics is sometimes played for much higher stakes. The measures which Parliament may adopt in a great emergency are unlimited. All that can be said is that they must not fall below the occasion. The enemies and opponents of the existing Union of these realms are bound by no considerations of forbearance. They have not scrupled to avail themselves of the agency of crime. They have an avowed alliance with factions sheltered by foreign states, who boast that war can be carried on in disguise. They declare that every power they possess in Parliament and elsewhere shall be used to thwart and frustrate the legitimate objects of government. No external enemy could be so injurious to our national interests as this fraction of the Queen's subjects, who share every benefit of the British Empire, and who owe to that Empire the power they wield for its destruction. Never, we believe, in the history of the world has so much liberty been so wantonly abused. But the freest nations are also the strongest. The American people are as attached to free institutions as we are ourselves; but when the South claimed for itself 'legislative independence' and a dissolution of the Union, the rebellious seceders were crushed to the earth, and the States proved that the maintenance of the Union was the first condition of their national existence.

INDEX.

A

America, North, Mr. Parkman's works on the French in, reviewed, 84—first attempts at colonisation, 84—landing of Champlain at Quebec, 86—his activity in behalf of the colony, 90—formation of the 'Company of New France,' 91—history of the Jesuit missions, 92—torture and murder of Father Jogues, 96—ascendency of the Jesuits, 104—creation by Louis XIV. of the 'Company of the West Indies,' 107—conquest of New Amsterdam by the British, 109—political régime of New France, 110—Talon, the first Intendant, 112—zeal of Louis XIV. in promoting emigration, 113—settlement of the land on the feudal system, 114—progress prevented by the system of administration, 116—explorations of Marquette and of LaSalle, 117—extension of French conquests, 120—campaign of Frontenac, 122—demoralisation of Canadian society, 123—causes of the downfall of New France, 124.

B

Bible, translation of the, associated with epochs of human progress, 448—completion of the Revised Version of the Old Testament, 450—marks a period in the history of Biblical criticism, 451—relation between it and the Revised New Testament, 455—the Massoretic text, 457—Septuagint variants, 459—emendations of the Scribes, 461—mode of ancient Hebrew writing, 463—work of the Massorites, 464—extant and lost manuscripts, 466—inapt introduction by the Revisers of marginal readings from the Septuagint, 467—instances of unnoticed Septuagint variations, 462—marginal translations of Hebrew expressions, 473—the example of 'Abaddon,' 474—multiple alternative renderings, 475—analysis of the changes made by the Revisers, 481—the verdict on the Revisers' work, 494.

Brogie, Duke of, his work on Frederic II. and Louis XV. reviewed, 410.

C

Canada, French settlements in, 84. See *America*.

Coleridge, Samuel Taylor, want of a biography of, 301—his childhood, 306—his Bluecoat school days, 307—the Pantisocracy scheme, 309—lectures at Bristol, 310—becomes a preacher, 312—forms a friendship with Wordsworth, 313—the 'Ancient Mariner,' 314—his Juvenile Poems, 314—the Ode to France, 318—his idea of Nature compared with Wordsworth's, 319—'Christabel,' 321—collapse of his poetical mood, 322—addicts himself to opium, 324—restlessness of his habits, 325—lectures at the Royal Institution, 326—separates from his wife, 326—bewails his miserable condition, 327—his jour-

nalistic excellence, 328—his political views, 328—his thoughts on Church and State, 329—his critical capacity, 331—his life at Highgate, 334—becomes absorbed in theology and metaphysics, 335—revolts from the sensationalist school, 337—adopts the system of Kant, 339—object of his metaphysics, 341—goes far beyond Kant in his treatment of Reason, 343—opposes the ethics of his day, 344—divines on whom his theology was based, 345—character of his religious speculations, 346—the Highgate conversations, 347—his influence on thought, 350.

Corea, review of works by Messrs. Griffis and Ross on, 265—ports opened to the Japanese, 267—anti-foreign conspiracy headed by the King's father, Tai Wang Kun, 268—treaties concluded with European and other nations, 269—the plot against the Japanese, 269—outbreak of the rebellion, 270—attack on the Japanese embassy, 271—intervention of China, 272—Mr. Aston's account of Chemulpo, 273—difficulties in the way of foreign commerce, 274—poverty of the country as exhibited in Phyang-yang, 275—defects of Corean administration, 276—interest of Russia in the peninsula, 278—her port of Vladivostock, 279—necessity of a British naval station in the North Pacific, 282—description of Port Hamilton, 283.

D

Darmesteter's translation of the *Zend-Avesta* reviewed, 386.

Dosabhai Framji Karaka, his *History of the Parsis* reviewed, 386.

F

Frederic II. and *Louis XV.*, review of the Duc de Broglie's work on, 410—dangerous position in which Frederic left the French in Bohemia, 412—Fleury's letter to Königsegg, 412—the Queen of Hungary's refusal to listen to terms, 413—Maillebois ordered to march on Bohemia, 415—failure to relieve Prague, 417—retreat of Belle-Isle from Prague, 418—Louis' new mistress, Madame de Tournelle, 420—conversations of Frederic with Lord Hyndford, 423—the battle of Dettingen, 427—cause of the subsequent inaction of the allied armies, 428—accession of Sardinia to the alliance, 430—Frederic obtains the goodwill of Russia, 433—recommends a plan of campaign to the French, 434—consequences of the support by France of the English Pretender, 435—resolution of Louis to take the field, 441—evasion by Frederic of England's demand for assistance, 442—intrigues for replacing Belle-Isle in command, 443—success of the Austrians in Alsace, 444—determination of Frederic to enter Bohemia, 445—left in difficulties by the French, 447.

French colonial policy, 123.

G

Gladstone, Mr., resigns office, 286—his 'Address to the Electors of Midlothian,' 560.

Greville Memoirs, publication of the Second Part of the, 495—description of the young Queen, 499—Mr. Greville's portrait of Lord

Melbourne, 502—deplorable state of public affairs on the formation of the second Peel Ministry, 506—effect of Peel's financial measures on Parliament, 507—causes of his loss of popularity, 508—misstatement by the 'Times' of ministerial intentions respecting the Corn laws, 510—final resignation of Sir Robert Peel, 512—Mr. Greville's description of Peel, 512—character of Lord Stanley, 516—Lord Palmerston's Foreign Ministry in the Melbourne Cabinet, 519—inability to form a Whig Cabinet in 1845 due to dislike of him, 523—difficulty of accounting for his conduct, 534—character of Lord John Russell, 535.

H

Harbours, review of works by Messrs. Vernon Harcourt and T. Stevenson on the construction &c. of, 128—national want of systematic information on the subject, 130, 158—diverse phenomena of the tidal wave, 132—force of the sea exemplified at Bound Skerry, 134—and on the Wick Bay breakwater, 135—cement concrete in the construction of sea works, 138—harbours of the Scotch coast, 139—classification of the harbour requirements of our coasts, 142—want of a harbour of refuge on the north-east coast, 143—reasons for preferring Bridlington as the site, 144—the report of the Harbour Accommodation Committee, 146—public expenditure on harbours in foreign countries, 149—maritime defence of our great ports, 159.

Horace, Odes of. See *Verrall*.

I

Iran, faith of, review of works relating to the, 386—points of resemblance between Parsis and Jews, 387—how the Iranians became monotheistic, 388—Zoroaster and his teaching, 392—the Homa sacrifice, 395—dualism of the 'Avesta,' 396—origin of the system of the 'Avesta,' 399—history of Zoroastrianism to the fall of the Persian monarchy, 400—origin of the Parsis' settlement in Bombay, 404—their present condition, 405—extent of the relics of Avestan literature, 406—reforms consequent upon its study by the Parsis, 407—the Parsi creed and practices, 408—miserable condition of Zoroastrians in Persia, 409.

Ireland, effect of the Land Act in, 290—local government in, 295, 571—the threatened parliamentary struggle for legislative independence, 586.

Keats, John, Lord Houghton's Life of, 2—Mr. Forman's edition of his poems and letters, 3—birth and schooling of the poet, 4—becomes intimate with Cowden Clarke, 4—studies medicine, 5—makes the acquaintance of Leigh Hunt, 6—his first volume of poems, 7—samples of the work, 8—composes 'Endymion,' 12—the preface to the poem, 19—asserts his independence of the critics, 20—commencement of his illness, 22—'Isabella, or the Pot of Basil,' 22—the 'Eve of St. Agnes,' 24—'Lamia,' 25—'Hyperion,' 28—'Ode to a Nightingale,' 30—'Ode on a Grecian Urn,' 30—'Ode to Psyche,' 31—

Jeffrey's review, 31—the poet's engagement to Miss Brawne, 32—his death, 35—extracts from his letters, 36.

L

Liberal party, principles of the two sections of the, 293.

Livery Companies' Commission, report of the, 181—subjects dealt with by the Commissioners, 184—dispositions of a mediæval craftsman's will, 185—liberal endowment of education after the revival of learning, 185—popular regard for the Corporation, 186—origin of the guilds, 187—the Companies' charters, 188—how formerly administered, 189—their present functions, 190—nursing by the citizens of their charities, 191—their connexion with Ulster, 192—number of members and income, 192—provincial and foreign guilds, 194—the Commissioners' disagreement on the question of Parliamentary interference, 195—Sir F. Bramwell's answers to Lord Coleridge, 197 proposals (1) to restrain alienation, 198—(2) to publish annual accounts, 199—(3) to deprive the liverymen of the parliamentary franchise, 199—(4) to apply the Companies' income to purposes of public utility, 200—(5) to declare new trusts, 201.

M

Manchester Ship Canal, the, 155.

Martineau, Dr., review of his 'Types of Ethical Theory,' 536—the author's philosophical conversion, 537—key to his method, 541—unpsychological character of ancient philosophy, 543—the Augustinian theology, 545—the system of Comte, 547—idio-psychological ethics, 550—inward personal character of all moral judgement, 552—conditions of conflict out of which such judgement arises, 554—specimen of the author's manner of summing up an argument, 556.

Masoretic text of the Old Testament, 457.

Ministry, the late, defeat and resignation of the, 286—its career a disappointing one, 289—discordant elements in its composition the cause of its embarrassments, 292.

N

Naval warfare, the fighting formation of the future, 237—mutual confidence among the officers an important element of success, 241—doubts as to the value of modern armament, 242—M. Charmes' theory of naval war, 244—causes of the success of the 'Alabama,' 245—the Whitehead torpedo, 250—defence against torpedoes and torpedo-boats, 251—results of their use in the Franco-Chinese war, 253—probable change in the construction of ships, 256—proposed resort to barbarous methods of warfare, 260.

P

Parsis, works relating to, 386—their character as a sect, 408.

Pasolini, Count, Lady Dalhousie's translation of the Memoirs of, reviewed, 37—state of Italy and the Romagna in the last years of

Gregory XVI., 39—the Count's liberal opinions and friendship with Mastai Ferretti, 40—Mastai elected Pope, 41—forms a State Council, including Pasolini, 43—the people's demand for war against Austria, 45—supported by the Ministry, but refused by the Pope, 46—murder of Rossi, 48—D'Azeglio's ecclesiastical legislation, 50—Cavour's domestic and foreign policy, 50—liberation of Lombardy and Central Italy, 52—Pasolini as Foreign Minister, 53—his missions to London and Paris, 54—appointed royal commissioner in Venice, 57—accepts the presidency of the Senate, 57—influence of Pio Nono, Victor Emmanuel, Manin, and Cavour on the regeneration of Italy, 58—present condition of the kingdom, 60.

Parting of the Waters, remarks on the political crisis, 286.

Pasteur, Louis, review of M. Radot's Life of, 352—a peep into Pasteur's laboratory, 352—his first chemical studies, 354—discovers a living organism in ferments, 355—his theory of fermentation, 356—devises a process for preserving beer, 360—introduces improvements in the manufacture of vinegar, 361—prevents the deterioration of wines, 364—disproves the theory of spontaneous generation, 366—his researches into the silkworm epidemic, 367—attacked with paralysis, 369—his experiments with the micro-organisms of contagious diseases, 370—inoculates with an attenuated contagion for fowl-cholera, 375—his investigations of hydrophobia, 381.

Plain truths and popular fallacies on the political topics of the day, 558.

Probyn, J. W., his 'Italy from 1815 to 1878' reviewed, 37.

R

Radical Programme reviewed, 558.

Religion and science, review of Bishop Temple's Bampton lectures on, 204—origin and nature of scientific belief, 206—origin and nature of religious belief, 210—the apparent conflict between religion and the doctrine of evolution, 218—claims of revelation on our acceptance, 225.

Rivers, tidal, conditions on which their value for harbourage and navigation depends, 150—phenomena of the 'bore' in the Seine and the Severn, 151.

Roberts, Rev. W., his book on Galileo's condemnation reviewed, 204.

T

Taylor, Sir Henry, Autobiography and Works of, 160—except: a character of his early life, 161—three weeks of delightful solitude, 162—clerkship in the Colonial Office, 165—part he took in the West India slavery question, 166—his picture of the evil of West Indian self-government, 169—sketch of John Mill, 171—his first play, 'Isaac Commenus,' 172—his other plays, 173—his theory of poetic art, 174—influence of noble friendships on his life, 175—disinclined for a political career, 176—intimacy with Lady Ashburton, 177—portrait of Carlyle, 178—admires the literature of the

- seventeenth century, 180—relates an amusing scene between Lord Palmerston and Professor Wheatstone, 181.
Temple, Bishop, his Bampton Lectures reviewed, 204.
Traill, H. D., his life of Coleridge reviewed, 301.

V

- Verney, Lady*, her description of the condition of the French and German peasantry, 577
Verrall, A. W., his essays on the Odes of Horace, 61—the conspiracy of Muræna, 65—occult allusions to it by Horace, 67—the poet's morals, 79—emendations for metrical reasons, 79

W

- Wemyss, Earl of*, his speech on Self-Help, 564.

Z

- Zoroaster*, his teaching, 392. See *Iran*, faith of.

END OF VOL. CLXII.

